

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP  
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

MARCH 6, 2007

6:00 P.M.

EXECUTIVE INN  
ONE EXECUTIVE BOULEVARD  
INTERNATIONAL ROOM D

FACILITATED BY MR. HOLMES BROWN

PRESENTED BY:  
RICHARD BLACK, ASSOCIATES DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

REPORTED BY: AMY S. CARONONGAN, RPR, CSR (IL)

\*\*\*\*\*  
Registered Professional Reporters

WEST KENTUCKY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

Certified Shorthand Reporters  
\*\*\*\*\*

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MR. BROWN: I am now pleased to introduce Mr. Richard Black, the Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy. He will discuss the background of the project and the purpose and basic elements of the proposed PEIS.

MR. BLACK: Thank you, Holmes. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to be here tonight to welcome you to the Department's public scoping meeting for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

As Assistant Secretary Dennis Spurgeon indicated, this meeting is really the first part of a process to come to analyze the impacts of the GNEP proposals and to help the Department come to a sound and full decision.

You are a very important part of that process. Your statements, your comments, your issues that you may wish to raise tonight are part of that process and part of that decision-making process. Your statements will help us make informed decisions on reasonable alternatives and help

1           us assess the impact of the proposal.

2           We are here tonight because -- Assistant  
3           Secretary Spurgeon indicated this -- that a  
4           local organization, namely the Paducah  
5           Uranium Plant Asset Utilization Company,  
6           responded to a request by DOE in August of  
7           2006 to find out what public or commercial  
8           entities would be interested in hosting  
9           facilities that might support the GNEP  
10          proposal and be willing to conduct further  
11          studies. And you are one of the communities,  
12          one of the organizations that have been  
13          selected.

14          As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon indicated,  
15          11 organizations responded to the FOA, and  
16          also DOE selected two other facilities or two  
17          other sites. So there's a total of 13  
18          potential sites that could host one or more  
19          of these facilities.

20          Before we provide you an opportunity to  
21          make those statements, let me describe how we  
22          wish to proceed tonight. To put the GNEP  
23          proposal into perspective, I'd like to give  
24          you a basic overview of the nuclear power  
25          option, including spent fuel management.

1           Next, I'd like to explain how the NEPA  
2           process will help us analyze the GNEP impacts  
3           and alternatives both programmatic and  
4           facility-specific in order to help you  
5           formulate your statements tonight.

6           I'd like to explain the NEPA process, how  
7           it provides an infrastructure to help us come  
8           to a sound decision and with your help and  
9           involvement.

10          Then I'd like to explain a little bit more  
11          about the GNEP proposals, both domestically  
12          and internationally. Then I would like to  
13          talk about the programmatic environmental  
14          impact statement and the process that that  
15          PEIS will give us in order to provide a sound  
16          record for decision-making.

17          As I indicated, this is how we wish to  
18          proceed. This is the basic outline. Here's  
19          nuclear power basics. Nuclear power provides  
20          20 percent of the United States' electricity.  
21          Nuclear power reactors do not emit air  
22          pollution or the greenhouse gases that  
23          potentially contribute to global warming.  
24          And right now, the nuclear power provides  
25          70 percent of the emission-free electrical

1 generation in the United States. The other  
2 30 percent is hydroelectric, wind, and solar.

3 A typical commercial nuclear power plant  
4 generates electricity by the fission or the  
5 splitting of uranium. The uranium fuel is in  
6 the bottom of a reactor core. When the  
7 control rods are removed from the core, this  
8 starts the fissioning process. The  
9 fissioning process creates energy. The  
10 energy is transferred to water. The water is  
11 circulated through the reactor core. And  
12 when it's heated, it goes over to a steam  
13 generator.

14 The steam generator then produces steam  
15 from the boiling water. It is then piped  
16 outside of containment, goes over to the  
17 turbine building, where turbines then are  
18 spun by the high pressure steam. In turn,  
19 the turbines spin the generator, the  
20 generator produces electricity to go out on  
21 the grid.

22 Now, after completing an operating cycle  
23 of approximately 18 to 24 months, some of the  
24 uranium fuel is considered used or spent.  
25 Now, it's not the whole reactor. They do it

1           in phases and stages.

2           So some of the fuel then is lifted out of  
3           the reactor core, put to a spent fuel pool,  
4           stored on site until it's safely cooled down  
5           and some of the radioisotopes decay, and  
6           then -- but that fuel is replaced with fresh  
7           fuel.

8           Now, we have two approaches to -- possible  
9           approaches to spent fuel management. Right  
10          now, in the United States, we have what is  
11          called the -- a once-through cycle, an open  
12          cycle. "Once-through" meaning that the fuel  
13          goes once through the reactor core.

14          It's pulled from the core once it's used  
15          up or can't effectively fission anymore,  
16          stored on site. Ultimately, we will then put  
17          it in permanent disposal in a geological  
18          depository.

19          The GNEP proposal does something else. We  
20          call it recycling of that spent fuel. The  
21          spent fuel has tremendous energy left.

22          Roughly 90, 95 percent of the fuel still has  
23          energy left in it. The GNEP proposal is to  
24          recycle that spent fuel, pull out the energy  
25          that's left in the spent fuel, and also

1 minimize the waste in the process. We'll  
2 explain that a little bit more.

3 Why are we proposing this GNEP proposal  
4 now, which is recycling plus some other  
5 elements that I'll talk about. Well,  
6 basically, as we all know, the economies of  
7 the world are expanding. Economies that are  
8 expanding need energy, mostly in the form of  
9 electrical energy to thrive in industry. We  
10 expect worldwide demand for electricity to  
11 double in approximately two or three or four  
12 decades. So there's going to be a huge  
13 demand for electrical power.

14 And the U.S. wants to pursue this chance  
15 to provide electrical increased energy from  
16 diverse sources in ways that protect and  
17 improve the quality of the human environment  
18 and enhance our nation's energy security.

19 Here's the NEPA process that will help us  
20 provide the infrastructure to help us come to  
21 a sound decision on the GNEP proposals.

22 NEPA, as a federal law, National  
23 Environmental Policy Act, requires  
24 consideration of potential environmental  
25 impacts of proposed federal action and

1 alternatives.

2 This process utilizes public involvement,  
3 such as the scoping meeting tonight, but it's  
4 not the first time. I'll explain that later  
5 on. We use an environmental -- we developed  
6 an environmental impact statement to analyze  
7 these potential environmental impacts,  
8 discuss alternatives, reasonable alternatives  
9 to the proposal. And the environmental  
10 impact statement is then used by the  
11 decision-maker to make a sound decision.

12 In this case, though, in terms of the  
13 Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, it is a  
14 very broad program. It has both domestic and  
15 international initiatives that are being  
16 proposed. It has multiple facilities at  
17 multiple sites, and we decided the best  
18 vehicle to assess the alternatives and assess  
19 the impacts is what we call a Programmatic  
20 Environmental Impact Statement, a PEIS.

21 Where are we in the process? Well, we  
22 originally started with DOE issuing an  
23 advance notice of intent of what we're going  
24 to do as well as a notice of intent. This  
25 generated some public interest, as we talked

1       about, the FOA, resulting in a public scoping  
2       process, where we're at right now.

3       In terms of the 13 potential communities  
4       that may host one or more of these  
5       facilities, we are going out and seeking  
6       public involvement, that's where -- public  
7       input. That's where we're at.

8       We expect to issue the draft programmatic  
9       environmental impact statement this summer,  
10      which will then be issued for additional  
11      round of public input and public comment.

12      We expect the public comments to expire in  
13      the fall of 2007. That's when they will be  
14      due. That will result in DOE analyzing all  
15      of the input that's come in and issuing a  
16      final PEIS, which we expect in late spring of  
17      2008. That ultimately will lead to the  
18      Secretary's record of decision, which we  
19      expect in June of 2008.

20      The purpose of the GNEP Programmatic  
21      Environmental Impact Statement is to assess  
22      reasonable alternatives that encourage the  
23      expansion of worldwide nuclear energy  
24      production, reduce nuclear proliferation  
25      risks, and reduce the volume, the thermal

1       output, and radiotoxicity of spent fuel that  
2       ultimately will go to a geological  
3       repository, ultimate disposal.

4       What are the programmatic alternatives  
5       that we will be assessing in the GNEP PEIS?  
6       Well, the first alternative programmatically  
7       that we will be looking at is what we call a  
8       no-action alternative. It's basically to  
9       continue the once-through spent fuel  
10      management approach that we are doing here in  
11      the United States currently.

12      We'll have 103 nuclear reactors, and those  
13      that come on line in future years continue to  
14      go once through in their fuel cycle and  
15      ultimately spent -- store the spent fuel on  
16      site for ultimate disposal in the geologic  
17      repository. The United States does this, as  
18      well as several other countries around the  
19      world, I might add.

20      We will also, though, continue ongoing  
21      research in advance fuel cycle technologies.  
22      We have been doing this for decades in the  
23      Department of Energy at our national labs,  
24      advance the nuclear technologies for the  
25      nuclear power option.

1           What is the other programmatic alternative  
2           that we will be assessing? And that's the  
3           GNEP proposal. It's a broad implementation  
4           of a closed fuel cycle that could include one  
5           or more nuclear recycling centers and one or  
6           more advanced recycling reactors. And I'll  
7           tell you more about those in the next several  
8           slides.

9           These are the three -- I'll talk about the  
10          three fuel cycle facilities that Assistant  
11          Secretary Spurgeon talked about. I'll give  
12          you a little bit more detail about what these  
13          are.

14          The first one is the nuclear fuel  
15          recycling center. This center will separate  
16          spent fuel into its reusable constituent, the  
17          uranium that is left over that can support  
18          fissioning. And as Assistant Secretary  
19          Spurgeon indicated, the transuranics. The  
20          transuranics are those elements that are  
21          above uranium in the atomic fuel chart,  
22          atomic chart consisting of neptunium,  
23          plutonium, and americium, and curium.

24          The recycling center will also separate  
25          out the non-reusable constituents of spent

1 fuel, which will be considered waste. We'll  
2 separate those out and safely secure those  
3 for either low-level waste disposal or  
4 high-level waste disposal. But we will not  
5 separate out pure plutonium in this process.

6 Old technology separated out pure  
7 plutonium. Our new advanced technology for  
8 spent fuel management is to reprocess out a  
9 stream of plutonium that is not pure. And  
10 why do we do this? And that is to make sure  
11 that the plutonium that is going to be  
12 recycled is not weapons-grade material that  
13 could be used for the development of a  
14 nuclear weapon.

15 This fuel recycling center will also  
16 fabricate fuel for the recycling reactor.  
17 We'll be looking at some options on that fuel  
18 fabrication. But, basically, it's going to  
19 be transuranic fuel that will be put into the  
20 advanced recycling reactor.

21 That reactor, which is the next one, will  
22 burn that transuranic fuel, destroy the  
23 transuranics, mainly, hopefully, plutonium,  
24 and will eliminate those so they don't become  
25 a proliferation risk.

1           This advanced recycling reactor, as  
2           Assistant Secretary Spurgeon said, will also  
3           produce electricity. So we burn the  
4           transuranics up; we also produce electricity  
5           by this advance reactor.

6           Now, this advanced recycling reactor is a  
7           different technology than the commercial  
8           reactors that are out there today. This is  
9           a -- the base technology that we're looking  
10          at is a sodium-cooled fast reactor. "Fast  
11          reactors" means that we're using fast  
12          neutrons as opposed to moderated neutrons  
13          that are currently existing in the  
14          light-water reactors today. The fast  
15          neutrons, that technology will burn the  
16          transuranics.

17          The Programmatic Environmental Impact  
18          Statement for both of these alternatives will  
19          look at different technologies, as well as  
20          different through-puts for the recycling  
21          center, as well as alternatives in the power  
22          output of the reactor.

23          When we get at the lower end of these  
24          through-puts, we're looking at  
25          engineering-scale facilities. When we get to

1 the higher end of the through-put end and  
2 megawatt thermal of the reactor, we're  
3 looking at more commercial applications of  
4 these two facilities.

5 And the note down there is that if we're  
6 getting to the commercial scale of these two  
7 facilities, we're looking at also the option,  
8 that these two facilities could be privately  
9 owned and operated and with potential DOE  
10 involvement and other federal government  
11 participation. If they become commercial  
12 operations, they probably will be regulated,  
13 let's say, by the Nuclear Regulatory  
14 Commission.

15 The third facility is the advance fuel  
16 cycle research facility. This will support  
17 research and development on recycling  
18 technologies, as well as the fabrication of  
19 the fast -- reactor fuel technologies.

20 This facility will also produce the first  
21 bundle of the fuel for the recycling reactor.  
22 But this fuel recycle research facility is  
23 going to be world class. We expect that  
24 we're going to bring scientists from around  
25 the world and start looking at advanced

1 technologies to really resume the DOE  
2 leadership in the nuclear technologies that  
3 we need dearly right now. This facility  
4 would be built and operated on a DOE site,  
5 so, therefore, the Paducah site here would  
6 not be looked at for this facility.

7 Here's the following sites. I mentioned  
8 13. Here are the DOE sites that we're going  
9 to be looking at, and I'll give you a table  
10 later. Here are the non-DOE sites, and --  
11 well, actually, the DOE site. Well, Paducah.  
12 It is there. It's a DOE site. Excuse me. I  
13 forgot we had the gaseous diffusion plant  
14 here.

15 For all of these sites, we will be using a  
16 screening process to look at the site  
17 characteristics and see if they fit the  
18 screening profile or the characteristics of  
19 each site that we need and we want to support  
20 these types of facilities.

21 So, for instance, if a site doesn't have a  
22 certain physical characteristic, let's take  
23 water, for instance, they don't have the  
24 source of water that we need. We would  
25 probably screen it out for further

1 consideration.

2 So I'm just telling you this, that even  
3 though Paducah may show up here, it may be  
4 screened out for one or more reasons.  
5 Conversely, this could happen to any other  
6 site. They could be screened out for one or  
7 more considerations. Ultimately, we'll come  
8 down with a handful of sites, let's say, that  
9 we will look at in further detail in terms of  
10 the PEIS.

11 Now, here are the sites, and here's a  
12 chart to indicate which sites are being  
13 considered for which facility. The Paducah  
14 site here is being considered for the fuel  
15 recycling center, as well as the recycling  
16 reactor. Here's just it in a nutshell.

17 What are the international initiatives  
18 that we're looking at for GNEP? The United  
19 States, as I indicated, wants to resume its  
20 leadership in its role in the development of  
21 the nuclear option worldwide. And we want to  
22 do that with the partner nations that do have  
23 advanced nuclear technologies now. I'm  
24 talking about countries such as France, Great  
25 Britain, Russia, Japan.

1           We're going to work with those partner  
2           nations to do two things. First of all,  
3           we're going to develop a fuel services  
4           program. The fuel services program will  
5           assure those nations that want to have  
6           nuclear power as part of their energy mix, we  
7           will supply them fuel for that reactor as  
8           long as -- if they refrain from pursuing the  
9           uranium enrichment and reprocessing programs.

10          So in other words, we will work with our  
11          partner nations -- let's say Russia, France,  
12          whatever -- and if some country, a developing  
13          country wants to have a nuclear reactor, we  
14          will work with that country to supply a  
15          nuclear reactor, but have a spent fuel  
16          management program that we will provide the  
17          fuel and also be able to have a program to  
18          take that fuel back for reprocessing.

19          The other part of this program,  
20          international, is a reactor program. And the  
21          reactors that we're pursuing with our partner  
22          nations right now, something we call a safe  
23          secure reactor. It's going to be reactors  
24          that's going to be a right size for the  
25          developing nation's needs.

1           It will be a smaller reactor than we put  
2           out commercially now in the United States.  
3           It will range in megawatts electric from 100  
4           to maybe 500. It will also be based on an  
5           advanced technology.

6           When we talk about safe secure, we're  
7           talking about an inherently safe reactor  
8           technology. We're looking at a very simple  
9           reactor to operate. We're looking at a fuel  
10          that perhaps will last decades so that we  
11          don't have to refuel that reactor. And we're  
12          looking at a proliferation resistant reactor.

13          And all of this -- and we're also looking  
14          at a reactor that can be built in modules.  
15          So if we build a reactor that's going to be  
16          200 megawatts and they need 800 megawatts, we  
17          can put four modules in place.

18          And the modules is important because we  
19          can fabricate parts of those modules off  
20          site, out of country, and help the developing  
21          country in its -- in terms of the design,  
22          construction, and operation, the whole life  
23          cycle of a facility.

24          And with respect to the international  
25          initiatives, we're not looking at any

1 specific international initiative at this  
2 time. We're not proposing anything specific  
3 at this time.

4 But what we want to do in terms of the  
5 NEPA process that we're in right now, we want  
6 to take a look at the global impacts that  
7 these international initiatives might have.  
8 We want to take a look at the environmental  
9 issues and see if they have any global  
10 implications. We want to talk about them in  
11 a qualitative broad sense in this PEIS to  
12 make sure that the Secretary of Energy who  
13 has to make a decision in both the domestic  
14 and the international fronts has a fairly  
15 broad record in front of him or her to make  
16 that decision.

17 Here are some of the environmental issues  
18 that will be assessed in the programmatic  
19 environmental impact stage. As you can see,  
20 some of these issues deal with people, some  
21 of them deal with property, some of them deal  
22 with economics, some of them deal with social  
23 economics.

24 But also, we have found in scoping  
25 meetings that some of the members of the

1       local public have local issues that they  
2       would also like to have assessed in the  
3       context of the PEIS, and we welcome those  
4       things. You have local information about  
5       things that may be important to you as we go  
6       through this process. Please raise those  
7       tonight or in other opportunities that you  
8       have to comment on the draft PEIS.

9       Now, DOE's record of decision, which I  
10      indicated will be in June of 2008, expected  
11      date, will determine whether to proceed with  
12      the construction and operation of the GNEP  
13      recycling facilities. And if so, where  
14      should they be located, what technologies  
15      they should use and what size of those  
16      facilities in terms of what we want to  
17      accomplish and how we want to accomplish it  
18      at that point.

19      And as I indicated before, we're looking  
20      at one or more recycling centers or one or  
21      more reactors. So determining what the  
22      technologies look like and what we want to  
23      accomplish, we may propose one or more of  
24      these recycling centers and recycling  
25      reactors.

1           Last note, DOE's decision will be based  
2           not only on information that we will develop  
3           in the Programmatic Environmental Impact  
4           Statement, but it also has to be based on  
5           decisions -- on information that is outside  
6           the PEIS, such as other economic studies that  
7           we're conducting to look at the range of  
8           things we want to accomplish in this  
9           comprehensive program, also technical  
10          information that will be developed outside of  
11          the environmental stuff that has to be  
12          assessed in the PEIS, as well as policy  
13          considerations that have to be looked at.

14          Congress gave us a fairly full plate of  
15          things to look at in the Energy Policy Act of  
16          2005, and we need to take a look at those  
17          things in the context of that which we want  
18          to accomplish with the Global Nuclear Energy  
19          Partnership.

20          How can you help us make a sound decision?  
21          We'll, you're here tonight. I'm very pleased  
22          to see the -- all of you here. It's a very,  
23          very good turnout. That shows that you're  
24          interested and you want to participate. We  
25          enjoy that.

1           You can provide comments to help us look  
2           at reasonable alternatives to these that we  
3           have mentioned tonight. As I indicated, you  
4           may have some local issues that you would  
5           like us to assess in terms of environmental  
6           impacts. You're here tonight, you're  
7           interested, you're involved.

8           You can continue to be involved. We have  
9           a website that's available. We're loading it  
10          up with information constantly. As we finish  
11          these scoping meetings, we'll have some other  
12          information that we'll put on there. So stay  
13          informed, stay involved.

14          You can sign up for a distribution list  
15          for the draft PEIS, and you can provide  
16          comments, as I indicated earlier in the  
17          slides. And we'll also conduct further  
18          public meetings as we progress through this  
19          process and select other -- further -- as we  
20          select sites for further analysis.

21          How to provide your comments? You can do  
22          them tonight, as we've indicated. They will  
23          be transcribed for the record. Do it by U.S.  
24          mail, you can do it by e-mail, you can do it  
25          by fax, you can even call us. The comment

1 period for this phase of the NEPA process  
2 expires April 4, 2007.

3 So, again, I want to thank you. Your  
4 showing up tonight is very encouraging. I  
5 know that you're concerned, and you have very  
6 good issues, and we welcome those issues.  
7 Thank you very much.

8 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. At this  
9 time, we're going to take a break to allow  
10 you to pose questions to available staff that  
11 will be back at the display areas and also to  
12 look at the printed materials in greater  
13 detail.

14 I will make an announcement when we're  
15 about to resume the formal portion of the  
16 meeting and begin taking oral comments. If  
17 you would like to provide an oral comment and  
18 have not signed up yet, you may do so at the  
19 back table.

20 Also, if there are media representatives  
21 here who would like to interview Richard  
22 Black, please see Tammy at the very back of  
23 the room, if you'll hold your hand up. Media  
24 folks, you can see her, and you can arrange  
25 to have interviews during this break. So

1 we'll now take a break to pursue questions,  
2 and I will call you back to order in a bit.  
3 Thanks very much.

4 (A brief recess was taken.)

5 MR. BROWN: It's now time to receive your  
6 formal comments on the scope of the proposed  
7 PEIS. This is your opportunity to let the  
8 Department of Energy know what you would like  
9 to see addressed in the draft document.

10 The court reporter will transcribe your  
11 statement. Our reporter tonight is Amy  
12 Caronongan.

13 Let me review a few of the ground rules  
14 for the formal comments. Please step up to  
15 the microphone over there when your name is  
16 called, introduce yourself, providing an  
17 organization affiliation where appropriate.

18 If you have a written version of your  
19 statement, please provide a copy to the court  
20 reporter after you've completed your remarks.  
21 Also, give the court reporter any additional  
22 documents that you would like to see included  
23 in the record, even though you don't intend  
24 to read them at this point.

25 I will call two names at a time, the first

1 of the speaker, the second of the person to  
2 follow in order to save time. In view of the  
3 number of folks who have indicated an  
4 interest in speaking, if everybody speaks for  
5 five minutes or less, we should end right on  
6 schedule. We have, I think, 30 or just a  
7 little more than 30 folks signed up.

8 I will let you know when you have a minute  
9 left of your five minutes. So if when I let  
10 you know that, if you can conclude your  
11 remarks. Again, all your remarks, whether  
12 they're written, spoken, faxed, or so forth,  
13 all count equally. So if you don't have a  
14 chance to complete all of your remarks within  
15 the five minutes, if you submit them for the  
16 record, they will have an equal impact when  
17 they are at the review.

18 Mr. Black will be serving as the hearing  
19 officer for the Department of Energy during  
20 the formal comment period. He will not be  
21 responding to any questions or comments at  
22 this time.

23 I will call the names of representatives  
24 of elected officials first, and then we will  
25 go on to members of the public. So let me

1 call the first person, Anna Caryl Guffey will  
2 be first. Welcome, and Jerry Beyer will  
3 follow.

4 MS. GUFFEY: Thank you. I'm Anna Caryl  
5 Guffey, and I'm here tonight representing  
6 United States Senator Jim Bunning of  
7 Kentucky. He has asked me to read a short  
8 statement of support.

9 I'm sorry I cannot be with you at this  
10 meeting in person to express my support for  
11 the application of Paducah and McCracken  
12 County, Kentucky, to host a Global Nuclear  
13 Energy Partnership facility.

14 I believe these public meetings are  
15 important opportunities to learn what each  
16 applicant can offer the GNEP program. As I  
17 am certain you will see tonight, the Paducah  
18 community is ready, willing, and able to make  
19 GNEP program a success.

20 As you know, this area of Kentucky  
21 surrounding the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion  
22 Plant has had a long relationship with the  
23 Department of Energy. The thousands of  
24 people DOE has employed over the plant's  
25 50-year history have played a vital role in

1 helping protect national security and promote  
2 the development of nuclear energy.

3 I believe that their expertise and  
4 relationship with DOE will ensure that a GNEP  
5 site at Paducah would be a tremendous  
6 success. I support Kentucky's effort to host  
7 a GNEP facility and look forward to  
8 continuing to work closely with DOE, the  
9 community, and my fellow members of the  
10 Kentucky and Illinois delegation to see this  
11 vision become a reality. Sincerely, United  
12 States Senator, Jim Bunning.

13 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Jerry will  
14 be followed by Zana Renfro.

15 MR. BEYER: My name is Jerry Beyer. I'm  
16 the second district commissioner for  
17 McCracken County and represent the McCracken  
18 County fiscal court.

19 I thank you for allowing our community to  
20 be considered as a site for the GNEP plan. I  
21 believe that this area has -- has the  
22 facilities, employees who have proven for  
23 over 50 years that we can serve our country  
24 in the field of uranium enrichment.

25 We have the property, trained,

1       hard-working employees and a community that  
2       offers educational excellence, progressive  
3       programs to enhance the lives of families who  
4       live here.

5               Yes, I know firsthand that this plant has  
6       a downside of dangerous jobs, but the men and  
7       women of Paducah, McCracken County, have  
8       proven over many years that they can safely  
9       perform their jobs better than any area in  
10      our country. We need this plant. We offer  
11      all the items needed to make the partnership  
12      with the Department of Energy the best for  
13      all concerned.

14             Thank you, again, and the McCracken County  
15      government stands ready to assist in this  
16      project.

17             MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Before you  
18      begin, let me ask, is the sound next door  
19      interfering with any folks sitting along  
20      here? Can you hear okay?

21             (No response)

22             MR. BROWN: We're unfortunately  
23      immediately adjacent to another meeting.

24             Thank you.

25             Please proceed. And Ronnie Freeman will

1 follow.

2 MS. RENFRO: My name is Zana Renfro. I'm  
3 McCracken County commissioner. In addition  
4 to that hat that I wear, I also wear a couple  
5 more that I think it's interesting to put on,  
6 too, when we're standing up here talking.

7 I'm a resident of McCracken County. I'm a  
8 mom with children here that have grown up  
9 here. I work for United Way and also have a  
10 father-in-law that was a long-time employee  
11 at the USEC plant since 1958.

12 To educate myself, I tried to put myself  
13 in the middle of this, and I've taken trips  
14 to Washington to help lobby with them. I  
15 attend regularly the -- we call them PUPAU  
16 meetings. I know that sounds funny, but the  
17 task force meetings, which is always an  
18 education in itself.

19 As I mentioned, I've been in elected  
20 office for 15 years. And my father-in-law  
21 always took pride -- I've been married for 23  
22 years -- in telling me about his job at USEC  
23 and what he did and the roles that he played  
24 and how the process worked.

25 Interesting enough, United Way does fall

1           into that. Because I feel if people who have  
2           to deal with loss of jobs, loss of jobs here  
3           in our county and our region and further  
4           out -- and that is a part of it I don't think  
5           we recognize, the economic graveyard this  
6           plant not being here will make on us.

7           The point that I want to make to you is we  
8           have a skilled workforce here that is  
9           experienced in working at this. Things have  
10          changed and the education levels and the  
11          knowledge that we know about nuclear energy  
12          has also changed, which is a positive thing.  
13          And we do have the investment in this  
14          community and the facility with an  
15          infrastructure of millions and millions of  
16          dollars.

17          The part that I want to say to you that I  
18          hope you hear because it does come from my  
19          heart. I have been married 23 years. My  
20          father-in-law did start working at USEC in  
21          1958. Two years ago my father-in-law passed  
22          away. But until the day he died from  
23          transitional cell, renal cell carcinoma, he  
24          always informed me and told me that the plant  
25          was a good place to work, and he always felt

1        safe. And the technology and the things that  
2        people were learning from their mistakes were  
3        positive in going forward. He felt this kind  
4        of facility should be in Paducah, McCracken  
5        County.

6        And the other thing he said to me, too,  
7        which was really interesting. When we  
8        talking about the energy and the foreign oil  
9        and all the things that are going on, we have  
10       a choice. We can either continue what we're  
11       doing, ship it out, bury it somewhere. Or in  
12       30 years, we can go back and dig it up, and  
13       use it as energy. Because folks, that's what  
14       they're doing in Europe right now.

15       I say this. I'm speaking from the heart.  
16       I'm speaking from -- because I feel I've done  
17       my homework on it. So all I ask you to do is  
18       to please get educated about the process,  
19       understand the process, and know that the  
20       possibilities this could bring to Paducah and  
21       McCracken County would be great.

22       MR. BROWN: Thank you. Buz Smith will be  
23       next after Ronnie Freeman.

24       MR. FREEMAN: Good evening. I'm Ronnie  
25       Freeman, first district McCracken County

1 commissioner.

2 As one of the 11 sites throughout the  
3 country selected and one out of six  
4 communities currently operating a DOE  
5 facility, we look forward to the continued  
6 partnership. We're proud of the economic  
7 growth the DOE has provided for over 50 years  
8 in operation of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion  
9 Plant in McCracken County.

10 We are committed to full support of the  
11 nuclear recycling facility. We look forward  
12 to working with DOE and Congress to make  
13 Paducah, Kentucky, the new home of this  
14 facility. Our community has a committed  
15 skilled and trained workforce ready to meet  
16 the needs and resource for this project. We  
17 stand ready to embrace the economic impact  
18 this exciting project will bring to our  
19 community.

20 We consider it a window of opportunity  
21 impact the project will have on our schools,  
22 our roads, fire department, police  
23 department, retail business, hotel and motels  
24 and other infrastructure. Paducah, McCracken  
25 County, provides a great mix of arts,

1 education, and entertainment. This community  
2 is open to change and ideas which bring  
3 economic opportunity. And we look forward to  
4 working with DOE and the reprocessing  
5 facility of nuclear waste. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Buz Smith is next,  
7 and Vickie Viniard will follow.

8 MR. SMITH: Hello. I appreciate everyone  
9 that's out here tonight. We've got a lot of  
10 people that are very involved in the  
11 community and have a stake in Paducah being  
12 successful.

13 I'm Buzz Smith. I've been on the city  
14 commission 11 years. And I believe this  
15 project is very important to our area. We  
16 have a tremendous amount of people in our  
17 area that are under employed. People I grew  
18 up with, many of them were kids and parts of  
19 families that were involved in the plant.  
20 And the success that we've had, we've been  
21 very successful economically in the early  
22 years of this plant.

23 Just some bullet points that this plant  
24 would bring, this project would bring. It  
25 would create 5,000 well-paying construction

1 jobs. That's exactly what we need. We've  
2 got a skilled workforce here that is second  
3 to none, could do a very good job of building  
4 the plant.

5 It would create over 1,000 well-paying  
6 permanent jobs, which is exactly what we  
7 need. We spend millions of dollars a year  
8 trying to attract industry and business to  
9 this area.

10 It would create spin-off jobs in many,  
11 many different areas. Expertise, it would  
12 create -- the people that would be involved  
13 in this plant would be highly educated  
14 people. They'd be earning good wages. It  
15 would create a lot of strengths, as far as  
16 our local community college and spin-off  
17 things, education in our particular area.

18 This would cause a \$15 billion investment  
19 in McCracken County which is -- I mean, it  
20 would be the largest project in the entire  
21 state, I believe, that's ever occurred in the  
22 state of Kentucky.

23 It would have a positive \$140 million  
24 impact on the local economy every year. This  
25 is every year going forward.

1           And I guess I'd like to conclude that, you  
2           know, we've got the labor, we have the  
3           expertise. We've got a lot of people under  
4           employed in this area. We are a nuclear  
5           community. And we -- I guess that's about  
6           all I can say about it. But I'd love to see  
7           the plant and the project located here.  
8           Thank you.

9           MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Vickie is  
10          next. I think you were the first person  
11          here, to be fair to others. Welcome. And  
12          Mark Donham will follow Vickie.

13          MS. VINIARD: My name is Vickie Viniard.  
14          I'm judge executive of Ballard County. We  
15          appreciate the Department of Energy giving us  
16          this opportunity this evening to speak,  
17          address our comments and opinions for Global  
18          Nuclear Energy Partnership.

19          I know that many of you in this room  
20          understand the tremendous economic impact  
21          that this project would have on our region.  
22          I know that you are like me, that you want to  
23          see planned growth, good jobs, schools and  
24          highways.

25          After having read about GNEP, I know that

1 I want us to find ways to safely and  
2 effectively use all this spent nuclear fuel  
3 so that we don't have to store it for years,  
4 and I believe GNEP Partnership will help us  
5 do that.

6 I'm comforted to know and understand that  
7 the nuclear energy field is not what it was  
8 30 years ago. This is not our father's  
9 nuclear energy. We have learned many lessons  
10 in the past, and we are now ready to apply  
11 them to make nuclear energy even safer,  
12 better, and cleaner for our future.

13 When we do this and we do it right, we are  
14 ultimately making the world a safer place,  
15 and we are securing our own energy  
16 independence. GNEP is a partnership that  
17 makes sense for Paducah plant in our region.

18 As a county executive for Ballard County  
19 and as neighbors to the Paducah Gaseous  
20 Diffusion plant, we support the efforts to  
21 locate one or more of the facilities on the  
22 DOE reservation. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Rex Smith will  
24 follow Mark.

25 MR. DONHAM: Mark Donham with the Regional

1 Association of Concerned Environmentalists.

2 I have some comments about the EIS process  
3 and some questions. In talking to some of  
4 the folks in the back, I determined that, in  
5 listening to Mr. Black, it appears that the  
6 plan is to make an environmental impact  
7 statement with two alternatives, the action  
8 alternative and no-action alternative and  
9 then to base a site-specific decision on  
10 programmatic EIS, and that is a really big  
11 stretch of what NEPA was intended, and I  
12 don't think that's going to fly.

13 There should be more alternatives. You  
14 should be looking at the whole range of  
15 alternatives of what to do with these fuel  
16 rods and not just predetermining the outcome  
17 by narrowing the scope of the EIS to just  
18 this reprocessing.

19 I have a question about the application.  
20 While first, I also think that allowing the  
21 applications to be filed before the NEPA  
22 process is really a strange way to go about  
23 this and, again, prejudices the process.

24 The NEPA process should have been  
25 completed before sites were allowed to apply

1           because then you could determine which were  
2           the most appropriate sites. Seems flipped  
3           around and backwards.

4           For example, in this site, we've been  
5           trying to get a copy of the application  
6           through Department of Energy through the  
7           Freedom of Information Act. And so far, it's  
8           been denied in total as being confidential  
9           business information.

10          Now, I'm not sure that any of it's  
11          confidential business information, but  
12          certainly information like the name of the  
13          applicant and the address are not. And the  
14          fact that this is being withheld and that  
15          we're having to go through this process to  
16          fight for this kind of information really  
17          raises a lot of questions and a lot of red  
18          flags.

19          And I've been told that there's a place in  
20          the application for a certification that  
21          there was community support to file the  
22          application, and yet, there was no public  
23          meetings, no public notice, no nothing. The  
24          application was filed just behind closed  
25          doors.

1           The Paducah site is probably one of  
2           the -- the worst sites that a person could  
3           think of to put a facility that's going to be  
4           handling these extremely dangerous materials,  
5           probably some of the most radioactive  
6           materials on earth. It is in an earthquake  
7           zone, and it is -- the proximity of the site  
8           to the Ohio River makes it extremely  
9           dangerous. The risk is just incredible.

10          The site handling lower-level radioactive  
11          materials for the last half a decade has  
12          become contaminated to the point where it's  
13          not getting cleaned up, contrary to some of  
14          the articles in the media recently. The  
15          groundwater contamination, there was a  
16          \$998 million feasibility study for cleaning  
17          up the groundwater out at the site about  
18          eight years ago when I was chair of the CAB,  
19          and that was dropped because it failed.

20          The technologies that they tried to clean  
21          up the groundwater didn't even work. That  
22          whole thing -- I mean, they basically have  
23          scrapped the idea of getting -- having a  
24          comprehensive groundwater cleanup out there.

25          Sure, some of this contaminated scrap

1 metal has been hauled away, but the biggest  
2 problems out there haven't even been begun to  
3 be dealt with, the old landfills, the old  
4 lagoons and ditches and such.

5 MR. BROWN: You're at the four-minute mark  
6 now.

7 MR. DONHAM: Okay.

8 MR. BROWN: What I was going to say, if  
9 you want to make a few more comments, I think  
10 we may have time after the other folks are  
11 finished speaking if you want to add to your  
12 remarks then, whatever.

13 MR. DONHAM: I'll use my five minutes  
14 and --

15 MR. BROWN: Okay. You've got about 30  
16 seconds or so.

17 MR. DONHAM: These fuel --

18 Now, the time you took didn't take my  
19 time.

20 MR. BROWN: Point well taken.

21 MR. DONHAM: According to the Department  
22 of Energy's own website, over \$11 billion of  
23 taxpayers' money has been spent on Yucca  
24 Mountain to -- and that was -- and we were  
25 told for years and years that this is going

1           to be the perfect safe place for these fuel  
2           rods.

3           And now all of a sudden, the use of the  
4           fuel rod -- of Yucca Mountain is nowhere on  
5           the horizon. And as a matter of fact, Mr.  
6           John Deutch of MIT had called Yucca Mountain  
7           very, very, very, very sick, and that's out  
8           in the middle of the desert in the middle of  
9           a mountain.

10          And so how -- so if it's not safe there,  
11          it's safe to bring it here in an earthquake  
12          zone on the banks of a major river in a  
13          residential neighborhood? Thank you.

14          MR. BROWN: Thank you. Rex Smith and  
15          Doug Harnice will follow.

16          MR. SMITH: Thank you, gentlemen, for the  
17          opportunity.

18          It is a privilege to be able to exercise  
19          our rights here, both sides. I respect  
20          everybody's opinion, even those I differ  
21          with.

22          I don't want to be redundant. First, I  
23          would like to say, as Zana did, that I do  
24          have some personal interest in this project.  
25          My family was a direct result of the first

1 project, the atomic energy plant out there.

2 My mother moved here from West Virginia.  
3 Her father was a plumber and a steam fitter.  
4 He moved here to work and brought his family,  
5 and that's where my mother and father met.  
6 My father was a maintenance man in a trailer  
7 park that facilitated the construction camp  
8 for the workers who built the atomic energy  
9 plant back in the early '50s.

10 So like Zana, I have raised my family  
11 here. I've lived in McCracken County most of  
12 my life. I am the president of a local  
13 highway contracting company, second  
14 generation, and we have lived and operated  
15 and worked in this community all of our  
16 lives.

17 I don't want to be redundant, but much of  
18 what my comments were focused around has  
19 already been said about the economic impact  
20 of a \$15 billion construction project. I  
21 think that if you're having a hard time  
22 framing that in your mind for a minute, just  
23 let me try to do that, if I could.

24 If you're familiar with Jefferson County  
25 in Louisville, you'll know that the UPS

1 project there was a \$1 billion project, and  
2 the work there has been unending since the 15  
3 years ago when that project first got off the  
4 ground. The work extended for field is still  
5 underway. The expansion at center field has  
6 not been completed as of yet.

7 Watterson Expressway has been widened to  
8 eight lanes. All the interstates in and  
9 through it around Louisville have all been  
10 widened to eight lanes. And even now, the  
11 largest public infrastructure project in the  
12 United States is being planned for the  
13 Louisville, Jefferson County area, southern  
14 Indiana, in the much talked about two bridges  
15 project that most of you who follow  
16 state-wide news know about.

17 \$4 billion infrastructure project to be  
18 built in Louisville has widespread support  
19 all over the region and will be built in the  
20 next few years.

21 If you think about what that kind of  
22 impact on our economy means, just look at the  
23 5,000 jobs the commissioners had talked about  
24 earlier. 5,000 jobs generate in excess of  
25 \$200 million a year in payroll. The

1           significant thing about that is during the  
2           course of construction, that will -- total  
3           that's been estimated, more than \$500 million  
4           in total payroll.

5           The multiplier of that, meaning it's been  
6           estimated by those who work in economic  
7           development, that the multiplier of payroll  
8           dollars in our community and in our local  
9           economy can be anywhere from four to seven  
10          times.

11          So four to seven times the \$500 million  
12          payroll will mean that there's going to be  
13          cars bought, apartments rented, houses  
14          bought, insurance bought, banking services  
15          needed, groceries needed. Everything  
16          imaginable in the economy is going to be  
17          increased exponentially because of this  
18          project.

19          So I think it's -- it would be a travesty  
20          for us not to embrace this project. It truly  
21          can be and will be, if we're fortunate to  
22          have this project, a defining moment in  
23          Paducah's history. Thank you very much.

24          MR. BROWN: Thank you. Kristi Hanson will  
25          be next.

1           MR. HARNICE: My name is Doug Harnice, and  
2 I'm deputy judge executive speaking on behalf  
3 of McCracken County Fiscal Court.

4           First, I'd like to thank you for  
5 considering McCracken County as the possible  
6 site for the GNEP plan. The fiscal court has  
7 a long history of supporting economic  
8 development in our area, and we appreciate  
9 the opportunity to pledge our total support  
10 in locating the GNEP plant here.

11           We believe this plant would bring new life  
12 to our community and outstanding growth for  
13 our region by providing up to 5,000 new  
14 construction jobs to build the plant, 1,000  
15 permanent jobs once the project is completed.  
16 In addition, this plant would produce  
17 all -- would reduce our dependence on  
18 imported oil.

19           The Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant has  
20 been a primary employer in our region and  
21 supported our community for over 50 years.  
22 This plant has been recognized as one of the  
23 best manufacturing facilities in the U.S.

24           The PGDP will complete its mission as GNEP  
25 begins its mission. Therefore, we think the

1 time is perfect to locate the GNEP plant  
2 here. Paducah offers the site, trained  
3 manpower, a state-of-the-art security system,  
4 utilities, a central location, and an  
5 international -- an international, through  
6 the DOE USEC, megaton, megawatt program.

7 In closing, we feel a joint venture  
8 between McCracken County and the GNEP would  
9 benefit all concerned. We appreciate your  
10 consideration and look forward to partnership  
11 with GNEP.

12 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Kristi Hanson.  
13 And John Summers will be next.

14 MS. HANSON: My name is Kristi Hansen. I  
15 live on a rural route in Brookport,  
16 approximately 15 miles as the crow flies from  
17 the USEC plant.

18 I have worked in Paducah most of those  
19 years. I have lived for 27 years in a house  
20 that gets its electricity entirely from solar  
21 panels. Why not bring in industries that  
22 build and researches solar, wind, and other  
23 alternative energies instead of an industry  
24 that has already poisoned our region and left  
25 a legacy of sickness and death.

1           Our community has already suffered and  
2 continues to suffer because of the uranium  
3 enrichment business. It would be insane to  
4 expose ourself to more of the same.

5           Transporting highly radioactive fuel rods  
6 from all over the world to Paducah on our  
7 highways, through neighborhoods, and by ship  
8 and air would put us all at terrible risk.  
9 The reprocessing is complicated and dangerous  
10 and is still in an experimental stage in the  
11 United States.

12           Huge quantities of leftover deadly waste  
13 would have to be contained. There is also  
14 the real possibility Paducah would become a  
15 target for terrorists.

16           Substances like irradiated fuel rods  
17 contain plutonium, one of the most deadly  
18 substances on earth and remains radioactive  
19 for hundreds of thousands of centuries. A  
20 high magnitude earthquake would render this  
21 region uninhabitable. Leaks and accidents  
22 from reprocessing in our air and water would  
23 be catastrophic. A person unshielded from a  
24 fuel rod would receive a lethal dose of  
25 radiation in just seconds.

1           Our community has already suffered and  
2 continues to suffer because of the uranium  
3 enrichment business. It would be insane to  
4 expose ourself to more of the same.

5           I am opposed to GNEP coming to our  
6 community. And I want you-all to look at  
7 this here, and I'll put it up on that table  
8 over there. But I think what's so important  
9 is, in the year 2000, the Courier-Journal  
10 exposed a report exposing how workers and  
11 neighbors were contaminated, used as  
12 experiments, and I think it's all really  
13 important that we all take that into  
14 consideration.

15           Down here at the bottom are pictures of a  
16 few people that have died horrible deaths  
17 because of that plant out there. Right here  
18 is the plume of all different kinds of  
19 radioactive substances, solvents,  
20 trichlorethylene that's -- to the Ohio River.  
21 It's miles and miles, goes under peoples'  
22 homes. The earthquake hazard, here's a  
23 little scale of how serious of a hazard it is  
24 in this area.

25           Here are -- is a chart, and it shows where

1 different radioactive elements, plutonium  
2 including, have been dumped all over the  
3 areas. Peoples' land, private land, private  
4 citizens have been living with this since  
5 1952.

6 And we want to bring this here? How can  
7 -- we can't trust the nuclear industry.  
8 They've caused so much harm. I mean,  
9 hundreds of people have died. It's affected  
10 thousands of peoples' families. I mean, it's  
11 just gone through the community, children,  
12 it's left a legacy of cancer. So I  
13 just -- I'm just shocked that people who have  
14 lived here for all of these years could  
15 possibly want this plant in our community.  
16 Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. John Summers.  
18 Howard Pulley will be next.

19 MR. SUMMERS: My name is John Summers.  
20 Didn't have a whole big speech to make.

21 I'm a neighbor and a friend to the plant  
22 for 40 years. I live within two miles of the  
23 plant. My business for 40 years has been  
24 within two miles of the plant. I've drank  
25 the water, the well water for 40 years in

1           that plant. My children have lived here, and  
2           I've raised my children here for 40 years.  
3           And I'm proud that we have this plant here,  
4           very proud.

5           And I can go on for -- tell you-all stats,  
6           but I don't know them. But we need this  
7           plant. We need the jobs. We're a nuclear  
8           community, and this is something that I  
9           support. And I truly wish that everybody  
10          here can support this effort.

11          And I would like to thank the Department  
12          of Energy for giving us this opportunity to  
13          give our comments. Thank you very much.

14          MR. BROWN: Okay. Howard Pulley.

15          John Williams will be next.

16          MR. PULLEY: My name is Howard Pulley.  
17          I've worked at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion  
18          Plant for 35 years. I retired in 2002. For  
19          at least 25 of those 35 years, I have been a  
20          very strong supporter of nuclear energy.

21          I believe nuclear energy is a must for our  
22          economy to continue to grow. I believe  
23          nuclear energy is a must if an adequate  
24          supply of electricity at competitive prices  
25          is to be made available to businesses. And I

1 believe that nuclear energy is a must if  
2 those industries are going to continue to  
3 maintain the current jobs and create new jobs  
4 for us, our children, and our grandchildren.

5 Nuclear energy, I believe, is also a very  
6 strategic component in our nation's journey  
7 toward energy independence. But if nuclear  
8 energy is to grow, we simply must have  
9 methods and processes that are safe to handle  
10 the spent fuel that is generated. And I  
11 commend the Department of Energy on this  
12 initiative which would do just that.

13 It is important, I believe, that during  
14 the formulation of the Environmental Impact  
15 Statement, that, factually, it be shown,  
16 which I think it will, that this initiative  
17 will, in fact, minimize the amount of  
18 radioactive waste that has to be buried, that  
19 it will enhance the safety of nuclear energy,  
20 nuclear power by reducing proliferation, and  
21 that this initiative will indeed recover  
22 valuable uranium from spent nuclear fuel in a  
23 form that can be used and will be used to  
24 generate electricity.

25 There will be many individuals, there will

1           be many groups that will strongly support  
2           this initiative. There will be many  
3           individuals, there will be many groups that  
4           will strongly oppose this initiative. And it  
5           is extremely important during the formulation  
6           of this Environmental Impact Statement that  
7           the views of all be heard. That is what can  
8           make this initiative a safe initiative.

9           But in the final analysis, regardless of  
10          the level of support, regardless of the level  
11          of opposition, I believe it is inherent that  
12          the Department of Energy and the Congress of  
13          the United States make the decision that is  
14          best for our country. And I believe that  
15          best decision is this initiative that we're  
16          talking about tonight. Thank you.

17          MR. BROWN: John Williams. Rob Ervin will  
18          be next.

19          MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Good evening.  
20          I'm John Williams. Thank you for this  
21          opportunity to share some comments regarding  
22          the proposed location of the new DOE  
23          facility.

24          Let me first tell you about my background  
25          and qualifications. I am retired from WPSD

1 television, a division of Paxton Media. I  
2 spent 34 years there, and the last 20 years  
3 was vice president and general manager.

4 Upon retirement I've spent time investing  
5 in various small business enterprises in the  
6 area. I'm a past president of the Greater  
7 Paducah Chamber of Commerce, past president  
8 of the Paducah Kiwanis, past president of the  
9 Jaycees. I'm a past board member of the  
10 Kentucky Chamber of Commerce and served four  
11 years on their exec committee.

12 I currently serve as treasurer of the  
13 Paducah Community College Board of Trustees.  
14 I've been named a Kentucky colonel by two  
15 governors, selected boss of the year, and  
16 given the distinguished citizen award by  
17 Paducah.

18 I give you this information not to boast,  
19 but in hopes you feel it qualifies me to be  
20 here.

21 I feel I'm here sort of wearing three  
22 hats. Hat one relates to community  
23 involvement. I know the importance of a new  
24 facility of this magnitude to the civic  
25 well-being of the area. I know DOE would be

1 a strong addition to this important entity.

2 Hat two, this would be the impact on the  
3 business community. Every business in this  
4 entire area would grow given the payroll and  
5 tax dollars generated. I can't imagine any  
6 business person not welcoming this facility.

7 Hat three and most important to me is that  
8 of a father and grandfather. I have two  
9 children who graduated from Paducah City and  
10 Paducah McCracken County schools. I have two  
11 grandchildren attending Paducah City and two  
12 attending McCracken County. We have  
13 excellent education. But it literally scares  
14 me to death to think about our kids' future  
15 given our strong dependence on foreign oil.

16 This will raise the cost of living to  
17 levels we could never dream of, to say  
18 nothing of international unrest. Nuclear  
19 energy continues and contributes to our  
20 national energy security by reducing U.S.  
21 dependence on imported oil.

22 Sizable domestic reserves of uranium for  
23 fuel exist here, as well as Canada and  
24 Australia. For all our kids and grandkids,  
25 we must have reliable electricity, that

1 nuclear energy provides.

2 It is also dependable because of the large  
3 size of plants, their long periods of  
4 operation, and the expertise with which they  
5 are run.

6 Here's a comparison of the capacity factor  
7 for nuclear with other types of power plants:  
8 Nuclear 89.3 percent, coal 72.6 percent, wind  
9 26.8 percent, solar 18.8 percent. Nuclear  
10 power plants, since 1998, have also achieved  
11 the lowest production cost between coal,  
12 natural gas, and oil.

13 In '05, the average production cost, when  
14 compared to coal, was nuclear 1.72 cents per  
15 kilowatt hour, and coal 2.21 cents per  
16 kilowatt hour.

17 Nuclear power is so important to the  
18 future of all citizens. McCracken County  
19 offers a very strong economic climate for  
20 this proposed facility. There is nothing  
21 more important to this area, and we sincerely  
22 hope Paducah is chosen. Thank you very much  
23 for your time.

24 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

25 Rob Ervin. And George Harben will be

1           next.

2           MR. ERVIN:   Good evening.   My name is Rob  
3           Ervin, and I have been employed at the  
4           Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant for 18 years.  
5           In addition to being a member of the  
6           workforce, I also serve as president of  
7           United Steel Workers Local 550.

8           Before I begin this evening, I would like  
9           to thank the Department of Energy for  
10          conducting this meeting and for allowing me  
11          the opportunity to speak on behalf of this  
12          important energy initiative.

13          As an employee with both operations and  
14          maintenance experience, I have witnessed  
15          firsthand the strict requirements that a  
16          nuclear facility must adhere to in order to  
17          remain operational in today's highly visible  
18          and highly scrutinized nuclear environment.

19          Several years ago, my facility was given  
20          the task of transforming itself from a  
21          chemical plant into a fully regulated nuclear  
22          facility. While this was certainly a  
23          tremendous challenge, it was one that we  
24          recognized and embraced as necessary to  
25          ensure our continued operation.

1           Today, I can stand before you and state  
2           that not only did we make the necessary  
3           transformation, but we did it in such a  
4           manner that milestones have been reached in  
5           the process. These milestones are not just  
6           in the areas of production either.  
7           Significant achievements have been made in  
8           the areas of environmental safety and  
9           regulatory compliance as well. Our  
10          accomplishments now serve as proof that both  
11          production efficiency and safety excellence  
12          can mutually exist within the same facility.

13          Now, some of you might be wondering how we  
14          can claim to be such a safe facility while  
15          environment cleanup activities are occurring  
16          on the plant site. The answer is really  
17          quite simple.

18          The environmental remediation activities  
19          that are currently being performed on the  
20          plant site are a result of very lax or  
21          nonexistent control measures and are a legacy  
22          issue from a bygone era. Simply put, we  
23          don't operate in that manner anymore, and we  
24          never will again.

25          To fear future opportunities because of

1 past transgressions would delegate us to  
2 living in the past and prevent us from  
3 utilizing our resources and capitalizing on  
4 our own assets.

5 As president of the union that represents  
6 over 700 workers involved in uranium  
7 enrichment infrastructure services,  
8 environmental remediation, and cylinder  
9 management operation, I am not only tasked  
10 with the responsibility of focusing on  
11 current plant operations, but I must look for  
12 ways to promulgate future opportunities for  
13 my membership as well. I believe that GNEP  
14 can provide such an opportunity.

15 When one looks at the time line that is  
16 currently in place with construction of the  
17 GNEP facility, which happens to coincide with  
18 the projected conclusion of enrichment  
19 operations at the plant, it becomes very  
20 evident that Paducah can provide the highly  
21 skilled and extensively trained workforce  
22 that will be necessary to operate such a  
23 technologically advanced facility.

24 In addition to the availability of the  
25 needed workforce, Paducah has demonstrated

1       this ability to provide the support services  
2       and community infrastructure that is needed  
3       to sustain such an operation. In fact, our  
4       ability to do so has now been on public  
5       display for over 50 years.

6       Should the Department of Energy go forward  
7       with its plan to construct the GNEP facility  
8       and should Paducah be chosen as the location,  
9       the Department will be rewarded with a  
10      workforce and a community that is  
11      appreciative of the opportunity, ready for  
12      the challenge, and who has already  
13      demonstrated itself as a proven commodity.  
14      Thank you.

15      MR. BROWN: Thank you. George Harben.  
16      David Polk will be next.

17      MR. HARBEN: My name is George Harben.  
18      I'm with the Greater Paducah Economic  
19      Development Council. I welcome you-all here  
20      and am grateful that you-all came here and  
21      allowed us to speak to you.

22      When you look at what's going on in our  
23      country, you have to recognize the fact that  
24      we are continuing to consume energy, and we  
25      need to find viable alternatives, and this is

1           one, and a very safe one and a very sound one  
2           and one that we embrace.

3           I think that you'll find a very welcome  
4           home in McCracken County. We have 50-plus  
5           years working with the nuclear industry.  
6           We're familiar with it, we understand it, and  
7           furthermore, we appreciate it.

8           We have a 1,500-person workforce already  
9           trained, already ready to go. We have vast  
10          resources that can help this succeed and be a  
11          success not only for us but for America as a  
12          whole.

13          And most import- -- one more important  
14          factor that hasn't been said too terribly  
15          much, we're within a 600-mile radius or about  
16          a day's drive within the 50 nuclear reactors  
17          that are already running. So that gives us a  
18          pretty good advantage in that respect.

19          You've seen strong leadership support.  
20          The fiscal court has come up and said they  
21          support it, city commissioner, and other  
22          county judges. That's important too. It  
23          just shows that we understand and we know  
24          that this is an important industry to us.

25          We welcome the opportunity to explore with

1           you partnerships and other alliances. Again,  
2           thank you for coming, and I appreciate this  
3           opportunity.

4           MR. BROWN: Mark Whitlow will follow David  
5           Polk.

6           MR. POLK: Hello. I'm David Polk. I'm  
7           speaking as an individual, just an ordinary  
8           citizen in Paducah. My family has lived here  
9           for five generations, so I feel like I have a  
10          stake -- as much a stake as anybody else who  
11          lives here.

12          It seems to me what we've heard tonight is  
13          pretty much a steamroller, you know. It's  
14          sort of already been -- people pretty much  
15          made up their minds, and most people in the  
16          community are for it. I think that's  
17          obvious. There are many good reasons they're  
18          offering to be for it.

19          But I think there are just as many good  
20          reasons on the other side. And briefly, let  
21          me just touch on a few of them. If we're  
22          thinking more long-term as in terms of our  
23          country and our community and the next  
24          hundred years or 200 years, not being misled  
25          by the short-term gain, which granted is

1 enormous. It's irrefutable. It's  
2 \$15 billion. I mean, that's dangling in  
3 front of us. How can we resist? It's hard  
4 to resist, but I think there are good reasons  
5 to resist.

6 In the long term, I would submit that not  
7 only are fossil fuels a thing of the past, or  
8 they should be soon, we all seem to know  
9 that, but I would argue that nuclear power  
10 production is also -- will be a thing of the  
11 past in 50 or 75 years or it should be.  
12 Because although it's -- the plant may  
13 operate safely. We are continuing to create  
14 this radioactive waste, which for, you know,  
15 millions of years will be around on the face  
16 of the planet.

17 The more we go to nuclear power  
18 production, the more waste we'll be creating.  
19 The idea that we could find a way to recycle  
20 it is very appealing. But there's always  
21 going to be a net gain in the radioactive  
22 waste on the planet.

23 Nevada won't have it. They've already  
24 spent 11 million out there. Now they're  
25 dangling 15 billion in front of us and all

1       these other possible sites, in saying, Hey,  
2       you take our radioactive garbage. Nobody  
3       else will take it, but we're willing to give  
4       you 15 billion if you will take it.

5       I just don't -- you know, as much as the  
6       short-term gain seems irresistible. Can we  
7       think -- can we back off a little bit and  
8       think more long-term for a change? The way  
9       we're affecting -- negatively impacting the  
10      environment around the world, I think there's  
11      a good argument to be made for that.

12      I talked to Mr. Black at the break, and he  
13      talked about how we're promoting nuclear  
14      power production around the world. As long  
15      as we're going to be helping the Chinese and  
16      the Indians, who are going to be the -- the  
17      economic giants in the next hundred years, as  
18      long as we're helping them hopefully steer  
19      away from fossil fuels, we should also be  
20      steering them away from nuclear power.

21      Because once every country in the world has  
22      this stuff, then it's that much more at the  
23      disposal of terrorists or anybody else who  
24      might take over a government.

25      Jobs, yes, God knows we need them.

1 Western Kentucky has many people who are  
2 suffering because they need a good job, and,  
3 of course, we're all for that. That's common  
4 ground we all share.

5 But all the bene- -- well, you can't say  
6 all the benefits, because 15 billion, nothing  
7 compares. But when the gentleman listed the  
8 things that are going on in Louisville, the  
9 big infrastructure projects, et cetera, those  
10 are projects that are investments in the  
11 future. They're not creating nuclear waste  
12 and whatever. They're positive  
13 contributions, and they will be as long as  
14 they're going on.

15 MR. BROWN: You're at the four-minute  
16 mark.

17 MR. POK: I have a minute?

18 MR. BROWN: Yes.

19 MR. POLK: Okay.

20 So why don't the city fathers of  
21 Paducah -- and I know they're trying actively  
22 to court new plants and new industry, you  
23 know, but the medical industry here shows,  
24 the way it's blossomed, it's a positive  
25 health-giving industry. We do so well with

1       it. We've got close to 400 doctors here.  
2       Why aren't we courting safe and non-harmful  
3       type of jobs? We could just as well be doing  
4       that. Granted it's not 15 billion, but it  
5       could be something solid and sustainable.

6       Let's see. We're sitting on a time bomb.  
7       This is a time bomb. The New Madrid fault is  
8       a time bomb. Talk to any geologist. It's  
9       only a matter of time. It's probably going  
10      to be big, 6 point on the Richter scale, 7.5  
11      they predict. It's going to happen and it  
12      won't be long. It may not be long. I hope  
13      it never comes, of course, but it could come  
14      tomorrow. We really don't know. Remember  
15      some of the hoaxes we've had where they  
16      promised it was coming next year. Let's hope  
17      we don't have to live through that again.

18      Am I through?

19      MR. BROWN: Make one final point if you  
20      have it.

21      MR. POLK: Okay. So I say no to this.  
22      Let's bring in helpful, sustainable industry,  
23      and let's make our national policy one of  
24      sustainable energy, like the hydrogen fuel  
25      cars that are already on the road instead of

1       sticking forever with fossil fuels and  
2       nuclear power, which have proven how  
3       dangerous they are. Thank you very much.

4           MR. BROWN: Thank you. Mark Whitlow. And  
5       Ruby English will follow Mark.

6           MR. WHITLOW: My name is Mark Whitlow.  
7       I'm a life-long resident of McCracken County.  
8       I've been practicing law here for over 25  
9       years. I was one of the founding members of  
10      the Greater Paducah Economic Development  
11      Council, which has the responsibility of  
12      promoting economic growth and development in  
13      our region.

14       I believe the vast majority of people in  
15      McCracken County and Paducah strongly support  
16      this nuclear fuel recycling project. This is  
17      because the nuclear fuel project would have  
18      enormous economic benefits to our area, our  
19      nation, and our world.

20       Paducah has been proud of the  
21      contributions of the Paducah Gaseous  
22      Diffusion Plant toward America's nuclear  
23      energy program, and yet we deeply regret that  
24      our plant is scheduled for closure in the  
25      next few years. We've heard a lot about the

1        economic impact on our local area. This new  
2        plant would utilize the services of many  
3        other plants in our area, including those in  
4        Calvert City, and would promote growth in  
5        that area as well.

6        More people coming into our community will  
7        improve property values as more people look  
8        for new and existing homes. The importance  
9        of this project to our nation and our world  
10       is obvious. We've already heard about the  
11       increase in global needs for energy. There  
12       are currently 30 nuclear reactors being built  
13       throughout the world and another 60 reactors  
14       anticipated in the next 25 years. Being an  
15       active and supportive participant in this  
16       industry is critical to our country's  
17       economic strength and national security.

18       Our country's production of enriched  
19       uranium and use of energy helps make us less  
20       dependent on foreign oil and improves our  
21       balance of trade payments.

22       The continued growth of the worldwide  
23       nuclear energy business makes nuclear fuel  
24       recycling plants a necessity. Where will  
25       this plant be built? Why not in America?

1           Why not in McCracken County?

2           Therefore, our nation's security is  
3           enhanced by such plants because if it's built  
4           here, it will not be built on foreign soil  
5           which could be subject to terrorists or other  
6           problems.

7           The project here makes good sense for  
8           McCracken County, our country, and our world.  
9           We are comfortable with the nuclear facility  
10          in our area, and we have a well-trained and  
11          highly motivated workforce to support a  
12          nuclear fuel recycling plant. I hope that  
13          our country takes the lead in building such a  
14          facility and that the facility be located  
15          here in McCracken County.

16          MR. BROWN: Thank you. Ruby English is  
17          next. Vicki Jenks (phonetic) will follow.

18          MS. ENGLISH: Well, I don't have no big  
19          titles or anything except I'd just like to  
20          tell you that I live at 6715 Metropolis Lake  
21          Road. I live on 11 acres. I am a resident,  
22          have been for 37 years. There is one field  
23          that separates me and DOE. And there is  
24          C-746-U Landfill that sits directly in behind  
25          my house. And if it comes on down to

1           Anderson Road, as DOE has said, then it will  
2           be right at my back door.

3           I have two sons, and I have two  
4           grandchildren. All of them has growed up in  
5           that same place for all of these years. I  
6           have -- I lost my husband this last year, and  
7           he had a lot of medical problems. He used to  
8           be a game warden at the game reserve, worked  
9           over there and swam the creeks, walked the  
10          fields, walked the -- all the woods and  
11          everything, mowed, stirred up the dust,  
12          everything while all of the releases were  
13          going on, but he didn't know at the time what  
14          it would do to him later.

15          My youngest son has what they called a  
16          degenerate cerebellum, the brain cells are  
17          dying. They cannot be replaced. He  
18          has -- he has been going on with this ever  
19          since he was 13 years old. He is now 37. So  
20          he has not had a life. There is -- my oldest  
21          son has a problem that none of the local  
22          doctors can diagnose because they don't know  
23          what he has.

24          I've had thyroid cancer, colon cancer.  
25          I've had half of my thyroid out, half of my

1           colon out.

2           My property, I am sitting on top of the  
3           northeast plume, which is 1,000 feet wide and  
4           120 feet deep. It is contaminated with  
5           transuranics. It is contaminated with heavy  
6           metals. It is contaminated with no telling  
7           what else, volatiles. It has not been  
8           cleaned up. There is -- every process that  
9           they have tried to clean up so far has  
10          failed. None of the new technologies that's  
11          coming out, they start out working just fine,  
12          and then -- but it never comes to the finish  
13          line. There's always something that goes  
14          wrong.

15          So you see, I have firsthand knowledge  
16          because I live there. Most of you people  
17          that's sitting here, you don't -- you don't  
18          have a house that's a mile and a half across  
19          from DOE.

20          We have plant neighbors that is currently  
21          residing a half of a mile. Nothing  
22          separating them except Little Bayou Creek  
23          that runs down, and some of it runs down  
24          through private property. We have a big  
25          plume that sits over there on C-746-U

1 landfill. And all in under it is already  
2 you've got the northwest, and you've got the  
3 northeast plumes. They're all contaminated;  
4 they're not cleaned up.

5 You people sitting here tonight, I'm not  
6 against this plant, so let's get that right  
7 out in front. I'm not an environmentalist.  
8 I'm not a businessman. I am a concerned  
9 resident that lives there. Sure, the money  
10 looks good, and I know that each of you wants  
11 a piece of it, and you'll probably get it,  
12 and that's fine. I sit and I listen to all  
13 of these meetings that goes on, the  
14 commission meetings, and all of these other  
15 meetings.

16 And you know, I applaud people for getting  
17 out there and doing what they believe in, but  
18 I'm doing what I believe in. My family is  
19 dying. You people don't know that, but they  
20 are. The whole neighborhood is dying. And  
21 yet we've got more that's coming in on us  
22 because nobody has took the time to see how  
23 it has affected the neighbors.

24 The neighbors are not even included.  
25 Everything has been geared to the workers.

1           And I don't fault the workers, because Lord  
2           knows what I've seen some of them go through  
3           and they're going to go through, and it's not  
4           pretty. And anybody that's aware of it, they  
5           know what's going to happen.

6           MR. BROWN: You've got a minute left.

7           MS. ENGLISH: All right. I'll use it.

8           So you see, whenever that we come down to  
9           it, what that we really need to do, we need  
10          to think about the safety first. We are  
11          United States born citizens. I am not a  
12          piece of garbage. I am not a piece of dirt.  
13          I am a human being. And all I ask is that  
14          you take the time to investigate, to get out  
15          there and look.

16          And I am neighbors with the former manager  
17          of DOE. I am a neighbor not far from John  
18          Summers, but they're not down on my end.  
19          They're on the upper end where the  
20          contamination hadn't gotten to them. So you  
21          see, there's a big difference whenever that  
22          you say everything is okay because everything  
23          is not okay.

24          You go around to 600 homes around that  
25          plant, and you're going to find the

1 illnesses, not just somebody telling you  
2 about them. You'll meet them face to face.  
3 And then you come back and then you tell me,  
4 I did everything that I could to make sure  
5 whenever that this came here, that the people  
6 in that vicinity would be looked at first and  
7 made safe. You do that, and then I'll say  
8 you bring your plant, and then you do what  
9 that you can with it.

10 Because one of these days that plant is  
11 not going to be there with it being built on  
12 top of those faults. Common sense tells you  
13 that.

14 I'm going to quit. I thank you for the  
15 opportunity of letting me speak.

16 MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you.

17 I had a little trouble reading your  
18 handwriting. How did I do?

19 MS. JURKA: Not even close.

20 MR. BROWN: Tell the court reporter what I  
21 should have --

22 MS. JURKA: I just typed my remarks.

23 I'm Vicki Jurka, and I've worked with some  
24 of the neighbors around the PGDP since 2000.  
25 In 2004, I collected protosamples from

1 community gardens, and I sent them to a  
2 commercial laboratory for testing. Samples  
3 of corn, tomatoes, and lettuce were found to  
4 be contaminated with plutonium several times  
5 in that ground.

6 We have been begging, literally begging  
7 for clinical health testing for years. We've  
8 begged the DOE. We've begged the EPA. We've  
9 begged the Kentucky regulators. No one  
10 cares, not anything about the health of those  
11 residents. You just heard from Ms. English,  
12 the condition exists out there. I've  
13 prepared these remarks.

14 A primary tenant for an environmental  
15 impact statement as required under the  
16 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is  
17 whether a major action significantly affects  
18 the quality of the human environment.

19 A tenant that is often ignored when the  
20 EIS is used as a bureaucratic tool to  
21 manipulate public perception creating a false  
22 sense of security when the instrument  
23 declares no significant impact.

24 In this instance, the U.S. Department of  
25 Energy and Nuclear Industry Partners are

1 asking citizens to embrace their latest  
2 vision, the Global Nuclear Energy  
3 Partnership, a compilation of previously  
4 rejected concepts, and trust them to prepare  
5 a fair and unbiased EIS.

6 Eleven communities, perhaps lulled by  
7 previous findings of no significant impact,  
8 have prepared proposals to further this  
9 vision. Citizens from these communities are  
10 petitioning leaders to first consider what is  
11 already clearly visible in their severely  
12 environmentally degraded neighborhoods and  
13 then reconsider the impact a project of this  
14 scope would have on the quality of their  
15 environment.

16 EIS procedures allow the architects of the  
17 documents to evade the linkages of  
18 environmental consequences to human health  
19 outcomes.

20 Let's explore some of the ways this  
21 occurs. A, the chemical or metallic form of  
22 a contaminant is considered when the  
23 radiological form is of greater environmental  
24 or health consequence and vice versa.

25 B, the synergistic effects of

1 environmental contaminants vary greatly  
2 contaminate by contaminate, interaction by  
3 interaction. The complexity of this effect  
4 inhibits full disclosure, so oftentimes the  
5 outcome is entirely eliminated from  
6 consideration.

7 C, the cumulative impact of the total  
8 project-wide waste stream, permitted or  
9 otherwise, is accorded less significance than  
10 the cumulative impact of other actions, for  
11 instance, transporting and construction and  
12 so forth.

13 Colloidal, energizing, or other actions of  
14 one chemical or chemical compound with  
15 another is not considered as an environmental  
16 consequence.

17 And finally, I can't stress this one  
18 enough. From a world perspective, the  
19 significance of a pollution-free aquifer as  
20 the essence of life is not understood. As  
21 can be demonstrated in many other ways, an  
22 EIS is not a perfect tool for ensuring a  
23 protective human environment.

24 Particularly, in this instance, the most  
25 detailed and comprehensive EIS imaginable

1 cannot produce any meaningful results.  
2 Plenty of opportunity exists for those  
3 promoting GNEP to bastardize the development  
4 of the document to their best advantage.  
5 This is already demonstrated through false  
6 claims that GNEP is meaningful and necessary  
7 to save the planet from the effects of global  
8 warming, as a nuclear industry continues to  
9 ruin what's left of it.

10 You will have adequate opportunity during  
11 this public comment period to educate  
12 yourselves and ascertain that GNEP is not  
13 visionary, that it is not a well-developed  
14 plan, but rather a severely flawed scheme.

15 Over several decades, presidential  
16 administrations were confronted with similar  
17 nuclear proliferation proposals and soundly  
18 rejected them. We are insisting you reject  
19 the GNEP proposal as well. GNEP is not a  
20 vision; it's a nightmare. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Jim Carmain. And Larry  
22 Sanderson will be next.

23 MR. CARMAIN: Thank you. My name is Jim  
24 Carmain. I'm a vice president with Western  
25 Baptist Hospital. I have a statement we'd

1           like to read into the record.

2           Western Baptist Hospital began serving  
3           patients in 1953, about the same time the  
4           face of the region changed with construction  
5           of the uranium enrichment plant.

6           Since that time, while meeting the medical  
7           needs of individuals, Western Baptist has  
8           been a good corporate citizen and corporate  
9           partner providing a broad range of  
10          occupational health services.

11          Those services include pulmonary  
12          screenings, health and safety education,  
13          wellness and fitness consultations, and  
14          on-site seminars, such as first aid and  
15          blood-borne pathogens and adult CPR and  
16          industrial rehabilitation for work-related  
17          injuries.

18          In addition, Western Baptist is affiliated  
19          with BaptistWorx, a full-service occupational  
20          health and wellness program. Care for  
21          work-related injuries is provided through  
22          Baptist Prime Care and in the hospital's  
23          emergency department. In addition to work  
24          injury treatment, BaptistWorx also provides  
25          medical case management, medical surveillance

1       programs, including drug testing, physical  
2       evaluations, and immunizations.

3       We share with you a list of services as an  
4       example of the depth and breadth of our  
5       experience and expertise developed over the  
6       last 50 years. We have worked with the  
7       nuclear industry to maintain a knowledge base  
8       and technical capabilities to support any  
9       needs they may have. We pledge to continue  
10      in that road to support any industry that  
11      locates in our community. Thank you.

12      MR. BROWN: Larry Sanderson. And Ray  
13      Dailey will follow Larry.

14      MR. SANDERSON: I'm Larry Sanderson. I'm  
15      international representative for the united  
16      association of plumbers, pipe fitters,  
17      service technicians, sprinkler fitters, and  
18      steam fitters in Kentucky and Tennessee.

19      Like my good friend John Williams, I've  
20      got a lot of past titles. I'm past business  
21      manager of Local 184 here in Paducah, past  
22      president of the Kentucky Pipe Trades  
23      Association, past chairman of the Kentucky  
24      Labor Management Board of Directors, Labor  
25      Management Conference Board of Directors, and

1 a past loser of the Kentucky state senate  
2 race. So hopefully, some of those things  
3 will make me qualified to say a few words  
4 here tonight.

5 And I want to thank the DOE for giving us  
6 the opportunity to speak out. And I, like  
7 some of the other speakers, you know, pro and  
8 con -- everybody's got the right to feel the  
9 way they want to, and they should speak up  
10 and say what they believe in.

11 I had a lot of bullet points written here  
12 tonight, and most of those have already been  
13 spoken. So I want to -- there's one thing  
14 that I think I can speak on that no one has  
15 talked about here tonight -- and I do support  
16 this project, I want you to know that -- is  
17 the construction workers.

18 The truth of the matter is, in the '50s,  
19 when the plant was first built, we were  
20 overwhelmed. There's no doubt about it. A  
21 job of that magnitude had never been in  
22 western Kentucky and maybe we didn't know how  
23 to handle it.

24 My daddy worked on that job. He's been a  
25 member of our local union for 60 years. And

1       so there were a lot of problems. And as I  
2       came on as business manager, I started in the  
3       local in 1965 and was elected business  
4       manager later on. A lot of the people that  
5       came into our area were concerned about the  
6       labor market, concerned about the  
7       construction workers because of problems that  
8       they'd had at the original building of the  
9       ADC plant back in the 1950s.

10       Well, I'm here to say to the DOE tonight,  
11       I want to tell you that one of the things  
12       that should be mentioned is there -- there  
13       will be a construction boom in this country  
14       in the next few years, and I want to see the  
15       sun shine on Paducah, Kentucky, for a change.

16       Manpower demands will be great. The need  
17       for skilled manpower will be even greater.  
18       The building and construction trade unions  
19       are already the best trained construction  
20       workers in the business. And my organization  
21       alone, the pipe fitters, spends over  
22       \$110 million a year nationwide for training.  
23       Add the other crafts on top of that, and you  
24       can see just how important a trained  
25       workforce is to us, and it should be to you

1           also.

2           We are not standing back and waiting until  
3           all this work starts taking place. We're  
4           going to be ready this time, quite unlike  
5           last time. We're going to be ready this  
6           time, and I want to make that commitment to  
7           you on behalf of the building construction  
8           trades union. We are increasing our numbers  
9           now so we can be ready.

10          In talking about manpower demands, one  
11          thing I think is very important and an  
12          excellent reason to locate the plant here is  
13          because of our unique location. We have  
14          Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, and Indiana  
15          closely surrounding us. If the need arises  
16          after we -- after we use all the local  
17          people, all the local skilled crafts people  
18          in this area in the state of Kentucky, we can  
19          reach across to those states and break  
20          skilled construction workers in from those  
21          neighboring states to assist us in building  
22          that plant, very important point, very  
23          important point.

24          I think you should know that six of the  
25          international unions have joined together to

1 form a MAC council, that's the Mechanical  
2 Allied Crafts, MAC. It's a new era of  
3 customer commitment. We hear you, is what it  
4 says, and we do hear you.

5 They offer the customer a no-work  
6 disruption warranty. Back in the '50s, when  
7 that plant was built, all I ever heard was,  
8 we had work stoppages. We will guarantee you  
9 if you build that plant here, there will not  
10 be any work stoppages. No jurisdictional  
11 disputes. The job will go on.

12 We'll have a policy for a standard for  
13 excellence for your employees that will  
14 adhered be to, a drug-free workplace,  
15 certified welders will be tested at no cost  
16 to the customer, no cost whatsoever.

17 MR. BROWN: You're at the four-minute  
18 mark.

19 MR. CARMAN: All right. I'll be done in  
20 five.

21 A safety-trained workforce, also at no  
22 cost to the customer. We believe -- we're  
23 going to do what we say we're going to do.  
24 We're not just going to talk the talk; we're  
25 going to walk the walk.

1           And I appreciate what all the people have  
2           said here tonight pro and con. But we need  
3           this plant here in western Kentucky, and I'm  
4           here to tell you that the construction  
5           workers in western Kentucky have proven many  
6           times over and over that they can do the job.

7           We stand ready, willing, and able to work  
8           with the DOE on any challenge that you might  
9           present to us. We can do the job, and we  
10          will do the job. You just give us a chance  
11          to prove it. Thank you.

12          MR. BROWN: Ray Dailey. Corrine Whitehead  
13          will follow Ray.

14          MR. DAILEY: Thank you. My name is Ray  
15          Daily, director of environmental affairs for  
16          NewPage Corporation, open paper manufacturing  
17          company in Wickliffe, Kentucky. I also serve  
18          on the Paducah uranium plant asset  
19          utilization task force as an industrial and  
20          environmental professional who has lived and  
21          worked in this area for 35 years.

22          I fully support the consideration of the  
23          Paducah site for the GNEP program. The  
24          Paducah site has many very critical  
25          components that make it the desired location.

1       These include an established, well-trained,  
2       dedicated, and reliable workforce already  
3       familiar with the nuclear processes.

4       Also, a major infrastructure of buildings,  
5       roads, and utilities, et cetera, exist to  
6       complement the requirements of GNEP. The  
7       Paducah site has had extensive environmental  
8       and geological evaluations that will enable  
9       the GNEP project to be designed and operated  
10      safely.

11      Now I would like to read into the record a  
12      House resolution that was passed by our  
13      Kentucky General Assembly, the House of  
14      Representatives, yesterday. The bill was  
15      sponsored -- or this resolution was sponsored  
16      by our local representatives, Stephen Rudy,  
17      Mike Cherry, J.R. Gray, Fred Nesler, and  
18      Frank Rasche.

19      A resolution supporting the efforts of the  
20      Paducah uranium plant asset utilization task  
21      force. Whereas, the Paducah uranium plant  
22      asset utilization task force was chartered to  
23      demonstrate to state and federal elected  
24      officials that the community supports the use  
25      of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant site

1       for the location of the facilities that are  
2       complementary to the site; and

3       Whereas, the Paducah Uranium Plant Asset  
4       Utilization Task Force, as a part of its  
5       charter, seeks to showcase Paducah, McCracken  
6       County, and the western Kentucky region with  
7       the goal of attracting a project or projects  
8       associated with the Department of Energy's  
9       Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

10       The partnership is an initiative that  
11       seeks to develop worldwide consensus on  
12       expanded use of economical, carbon-free  
13       nuclear energy to meet the growing  
14       electricity demand. This will utilize a  
15       nuclear fuel cycle which enhances energy  
16       security while promoting non-proliferation;  
17       and

18       Whereas, Paducah, McCracken County,  
19       western Kentucky, west Tennessee, southeast  
20       Missouri, and southern Illinois have a fully  
21       qualified and experienced workforce of 2,000  
22       people. And the region has the only  
23       operational uranium conversion plant in the  
24       United States; and

25       Whereas, the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion

1 Plant is the only operational uranium  
2 enrichment plant to recycle recovered uranium  
3 from the consolidated fuel treatment center;  
4 and

5 Whereas, the Paducah Uranium Plant Asset  
6 Utilization Task Force is conducting an  
7 informational campaign to educate the public  
8 about its efforts and the Global Nuclear  
9 Energy Partnership; and

10 Whereas, the Paducah Uranium Plant Asset  
11 Utilization Task Force efforts secure Global  
12 Nuclear Energy Partnership projects as  
13 world-class corporate partners in CH2M Hill  
14 and Honeywell, as well as outstanding  
15 community leadership from co-chairs Bill  
16 Paxton, Mayor of Paducah; and Van Newberry,  
17 McCracken County Judge Executive; and.

18 Whereas, the Global Nuclear Energy  
19 Partnership project or projects would bring  
20 5,000 construction jobs and 1,000 permanent  
21 jobs to the region enhancing the economics of  
22 western Kentucky, west Tennessee, southeast  
23 Missouri, and Southern Illinois.

24 Now, therefore, be it resolved by the  
25 House of Representatives of the General

1       Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the  
2       Kentucky House of Representatives supports  
3       the Paducah Uranium Plant Asset Utilization  
4       Task Force efforts and urges the U.S.  
5       Department of Energy to locate one or more of  
6       the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership  
7       projects at the United States Department of  
8       Energy federal reservation in McCracken  
9       County, Kentucky.

10       Thank you.

11       MR. BROWN:   Okay.   Corrine Whitehead.  
12       Steve Polston will be next.

13       MS. WHITEHEAD:   I'm Corrine Whitehead,  
14       chairman of the Coalition for Health Concern.  
15       This is an old group that was established in  
16       1985 some years ago at a national conference,  
17       I met Dr. Samuel Epstein, who is from Great  
18       Britain, an internationally recognized cancer  
19       research scientist.

20       He said, "Where are you from?"

21       And I said, "A few miles, about 18 miles  
22       down south of Paducah, Kentucky."

23       "Oh," he said, "you are in the cancer hot  
24       spot."

25       I was really dumbfounded.

1           But we have worked closely with the  
2           community out around the plant, and I'm going  
3           to file on behalf of the coalition a written  
4           statement in opposition to GNEP, so I won't  
5           take your five minutes, but thank you for  
6           allowing me to speak.

7           My last comment is that the largest  
8           industry now in McCracken County is the  
9           health industry. And with this project, you  
10          have big problems with environmental justice.

11          MR. BROWN:     Steve Polston. Barbara  
12          Veazey will be next.

13          MR. POLSTON:   Well, thank you. I think  
14          Larry Sanderson is right. All the good  
15          points have been used up. I was somewhat  
16          encouraged to hear of -- being a former  
17          Tennesseean, Larry said the Tennesseans  
18          would be welcomed into the state, even though  
19          it was like fifth priority, but that was a  
20          bit pleasing.

21          I do -- I kind of threw away my card,  
22          and -- a lot of good points. I am proud to  
23          be a part of a country that -- I mean,  
24          unrelated to what DOE is doing here. I'm  
25          proud to be part of a country that can hear

1       sharply contrasting views, listen to those,  
2       and take those into consideration. There are  
3       places that you can't do that. So I just  
4       express thanks for the process we have.

5       Let me say I'm president of Swift &  
6       Staley, and we do some nuclear-related work  
7       here now. Before that, I was -- ran a  
8       company in Tennessee. Before that, I lived  
9       in southern France for a year and a half.

10      So I just offer what I saw,  
11      offer -- regardless of what you think of the  
12      French, you know, there's probably a good  
13      lively discussion could go on here about  
14      that. But they -- 80 percent of the French  
15      nuclear -- or electricity is generated by  
16      nuclear power.

17      They have reprocessing that we're talking  
18      about, thinking about doing, and they even do  
19      it for other countries to some degree. They  
20      do it safely, and they do it economically.  
21      I'm of the view that we certainly can do  
22      anything as well as the French can do, if not  
23      better. That's just the observation I wanted  
24      to make to you tonight. Thank you.

25      MR. BROWN: Barbara Veazey. Linda Long

1 will be after Barbara.

2 MS. VEAZEY: I'm Barbara Veazey, president  
3 of West Kentucky Community and Technical  
4 College. And West Kentucky Community and  
5 Technical College is fully prepared to meet  
6 the educational needs and prepare a qualified  
7 workforce for the Global Nuclear Energy  
8 Partnership initiative. The college has a  
9 current enrollment of 7,000 students in  
10 technical and transfer programs, high school  
11 dual credit and training classes for business  
12 and industry.

13 We have technical programs from  
14 construction to health physics to engineering  
15 technology and engineering. We have a  
16 collaborative relationship with Murray State  
17 University, and the University of Kentucky  
18 College of Engineering is located on our  
19 campus.

20 We have a new emerging technology center  
21 planned to open in the spring of 2009. We  
22 have the flexibility to adapt and accommodate  
23 training needs.

24 The University of Kentucky College of  
25 Engineering in Paducah has conducted limited

1 research on the use of depleted uranium and  
2 has the capacity to expand those research  
3 capabilities in the new emerging technology  
4 center.

5 So in summary, we have our regional state  
6 university, Murray State, the University of  
7 Kentucky with the College of Engineering,  
8 current research activity, and the community  
9 and technical college with the ability to  
10 adapt and react. We work collaboratively and  
11 cooperatively and will serve as an asset in  
12 the siting of this project in Paducah. Thank  
13 you.

14 MR. BROWN: Linda Long. And Bill Murphy  
15 will be after Linda.

16 MS. LONG: I'm Linda Long. Most of you  
17 people here know me. Some of my good friends  
18 are here tonight. I live about a mile across  
19 the field from the plant on land that's been  
20 in our family more or less for years. I'm a  
21 descendant of the Baldwin family. The  
22 Baldwin family came to western McCracken  
23 County in the late -- in the 1850s, and part  
24 of the land where the plant is is located on  
25 land that they originally settled.

1 I look at this land. I've been in every  
2 state except Hawaii. I've been in other  
3 parts of the world, and it's such a beautiful  
4 countryside. I just think why destroy this?  
5 Why destroy the people that live there? So  
6 many people are in denial. They've had their  
7 heads in the sand. They refuse to believe  
8 that there's anything wrong out there.

9 There's something in the well, the surface  
10 water, the soil, it's been in the air.  
11 Anytime you introduce any kind of thing that  
12 might involve air and air emissions, you're,  
13 again, sending that into the air. I fully  
14 believe that's the cause of so much of the  
15 cancer around Grandville.

16 I was a member of the board for ten years.  
17 I've been to a number of nuclear sites,  
18 probably more of them than most of the people  
19 who are here tonight. I have my own idea.  
20 We've had the KOW, 1942. We've had the  
21 gaseous diffusion plant and now the prospect  
22 of something else.

23 All of those have been bad news in one way  
24 or the other. They have affected the people  
25 of the community. They have affected the

1 families living there. In 1942, my dad had  
2 his livelihood removed, because in two weeks  
3 you can't remove orchards and a herd of dairy  
4 cattle. He was left with nothing. It has  
5 left its legacy behind.

6 I don't think this is a good location. I  
7 think it's the worst one you could think of.  
8 You have this little thing in your folder  
9 about these other considered locations  
10 they're considering. Look at them. I've  
11 been to most of them. Number 1, Idaho would  
12 be my first choice. 890 square miles, not  
13 just acres with a lot of people living around  
14 them. It is literally in the middle of  
15 nowhere. They even have a transportation  
16 people -- system to bring people into work  
17 there.

18 That would be my first choice. Hanford  
19 would be another good choice. It has  
20 586 square miles. It already has a huge  
21 amount of contamination. The people of  
22 Nevada don't want it. They don't even want  
23 those fuel cells crossing their state line.

24 I've been down in Yucca Mountain. They  
25 want -- would prefer that they go somewhere

1           else. The states around there don't want  
2           those things there.

3           Another good one might be Hobbs, New  
4           Mexico. It's only 12 miles from Carlsbad or  
5           from the WIPP facility. I've been in that.  
6           That's where they're storing waste in the  
7           layers of salt over 2,000 feet below the  
8           ground. That salt encapsulates those  
9           materials. So if they had any extra waste,  
10          jot it on over there, store it in the salt.  
11          It's interesting.

12          I think that people around here are so  
13          eager for jobs they'll take anything, even if  
14          it means their lives, their family's lives,  
15          their friends' lives, their relatives' lives.

16          But this is, I think, the worst choice on  
17          the entire list. If you want a job, well,  
18          maybe you can get a job taking some of those  
19          dangerous things apart. The people who took  
20          apart those bombs over there, a lot of them  
21          waded in that material and died with cancer.  
22          Some people said, well, everybody over there  
23          didn't die. Yeah, but they weren't doing  
24          like that. They weren't burying bomb parts.  
25          This is a bad --

1           MR. BROWN:   You've got a minute left.

2           MS. VEAZEY:   I've said all I wanted to  
3           say.   If you want to hear more of what I had  
4           to say, you should have read Sunday's paper.

5           MR. BROWN:   Bill Murphy.   And Chris Naas  
6           will follow.

7           MR. MURPHY:   My name is Bill Murphy.   I'm  
8           a professor of mechanical engineering with  
9           the University of Kentucky and director of  
10          the UK engineering extended campus program  
11          located in Paducah.   Obviously, my remarks  
12          represent my personal opinions and do not  
13          reflect an official position of the  
14          University of Kentucky.

15          I have interest in this issue from several  
16          perspectives.   My area of specialization is  
17          energy utilization in buildings, which  
18          consume roughly about a third of all the  
19          energy produced in the United States and  
20          probably more than half of all the  
21          electricity generated.

22          Anyone that studies energy usage  
23          understands that a country's standard of  
24          living is related to its availability of  
25          energy.   While we can always conserve to

1       reduce our consumption -- and that's what  
2       area I focus on -- we still must provide  
3       basic electricity for the many benefits of  
4       which we all have become accustomed.

5           From an energy supply and demand  
6       perspective, it's clear that nuclear energy  
7       must continue to play an important role in  
8       our energy mix. And as many environmental  
9       leaders recognize, its neutral impact on  
10      carbon emissions work strongly in its favor  
11      compared to traditional fossil fuel power  
12      generation.

13          As an engineering educator in the Paducah  
14      area, I welcome the opportunity for my  
15      engineering graduates to have high-paying  
16      technical jobs where they can stay close to  
17      their families.

18          We graduate about 15 mechanical  
19      engineering and 5 chemical engineering  
20      students every year from this immediate area.  
21      Many of them with family members that  
22      currently work at the gaseous diffusion  
23      plant. They're familiar with the risks and  
24      opportunities for technical careers in this  
25      field.

1           Because of the positive experiences that  
2           their families have experienced with their  
3           careers at the plant, most would welcome an  
4           expanded nuclear energy in western Kentucky  
5           as a career option upon their graduation.

6           A number of the types of jobs that would  
7           be required to properly handle the nuclear  
8           materials could be covered by our local  
9           engineering graduates. In addition, many of  
10          the other technical positions that may not  
11          require a four-year engineering degree could  
12          employ a two-year engineering technologist  
13          that West Kentucky Community and Technical  
14          College is gearing up to produce in their new  
15          emerging technology center.

16          Having an employer in the area that could  
17          take many of our graduates would be a welcome  
18          chance for our region to retain the best and  
19          brightest and not lose them to some other  
20          state or region.

21          My third interest in this topic deals with  
22          the fact I'm a resident of McCracken County,  
23          and so I obviously have a vested interest in  
24          a safe environment in which I can live. I  
25          firmly believe we must properly handle spent

1 nuclear fuel from the power industry in a way  
2 that's environmentally safe for generations  
3 to come.

4 The political deadlocks that have  
5 prevented the industry from dealing with this  
6 issue adequately today must not be allowed to  
7 prevent solutions from being found. Other  
8 countries have already done so, as Steve  
9 Polston recognized.

10 From an engineering perspective, this  
11 proposed facility is a logical step in the  
12 nuclear power cycle and should have been  
13 developed years ago. The current practice of  
14 storing huge reactor fuel on a power plant  
15 site wastes valuable energy resources,  
16 requires dispersed security measures, and  
17 leaves intact potentially dangerous  
18 transuranics.

19 Paducah's location, within a day's drive  
20 of half the nation's power reactors, will  
21 minimize the transportation hazard of moving  
22 the used fuel for recycling, while also  
23 reducing a potential for interstate transport  
24 conflicts.

25 In summary, a recycling facility using the

1 best science available would make the  
2 nation's nuclear power industry safer for  
3 everyone. It will preserve a tremendous  
4 domestic source of energy. The central  
5 location of Paducah, with its many  
6 transportation options will minimize  
7 transport logistics.

8 This region has the workforce with the  
9 necessary technical skills to support the  
10 safe operation of these technologies. And  
11 the decision to expand safer nuclear power  
12 and responsive global climate change and  
13 diminishing fossil fuel supplies is a  
14 necessary response by the United States  
15 government. And I believe that the Paducah  
16 region will welcome an important role in this  
17 decision in our country. Thank you for your  
18 opportunity to make these remarks.

19 MR. BROWN: Chris will be followed by Gary  
20 Vander Boegh.

21 MR. NAAS: My name is Chris Naas. I'm a  
22 heavy equipment operator out at the Paducah  
23 plant, been there for 32 years. I don't have  
24 a lot to say. I don't have a speech. I  
25 didn't know I was coming till an hour ago

1           when I got a phone call. So I'm here to air  
2           something.

3           The GNEP, I'm looking forward to it,  
4           looking forward to it. I've had -- DOE has  
5           had big, big blunders in the past. That  
6           won't happen this time. It won't happen  
7           because of the blunders that they've had in  
8           the past. I look forward to the GNEP. I  
9           hope my son can work at GNEP. I'm speaking  
10          from my heart. I hope I don't talk in  
11          circles.

12          Now I'm going to approach some old. We  
13          got a little bitter and a little sweet. The  
14          sweet I hope is for the GNEP. The bitter is,  
15          I testified back in 1999 about some of the  
16          things that took place out at that plant.  
17          I'm a heavy equipment operator. I've cleaned  
18          ditches. I've buried waste. I recently went  
19          to a CAB meeting.

20          After the CAB meeting, I was approached by  
21          Bill Murphy, the head of DOE operations. He  
22          told me he couldn't put much credibility in  
23          what I said because I didn't have dates  
24          written down for what I reported.

25          I challenge him, DOE, anybody in this room

1       about my credibility when I tell you I  
2       cleaned the ditch, when I tell you I buried  
3       something. I challenge anybody against my  
4       credibility. Because whenever I'm telling  
5       you I did it, I did it.

6       Dave Mast, I was told, said I didn't have  
7       any credibility because I had made some other  
8       statements in the past. Maybe I'm wrong. I  
9       don't know Dave Mast. Don't care. I'd like  
10      to meet him.

11      But I'm telling you, if you don't believe  
12      me, take an ad in the paper. Let's get some  
13      other people out here to back up these  
14      stories. Let's clean up the mess that has  
15      been out there in the past, and we'll move on  
16      to GNEP, and there won't be a mess. But  
17      there's a mess out there to be cleaned up.

18      Pay my insurance, take care of me, take  
19      care of those neighbors, take care of your  
20      responsibility. And I know you will on the  
21      GNEP, but let's clean up the past. And I  
22      challenge you again. My credibility stands  
23      when I tell you I buried something there.  
24      I'm done.

25      MR. BROWN: Gary will be followed by Lynn

1 King.

2 MR. VANDER BOEGH: Well, I thought I might  
3 save the best for last. I'm Gary Vander  
4 Boegh, former landfill manager for the DOE  
5 solid waste landfill at the plant.

6 I started working there about 14 years  
7 ago. Steve Polston hired me. I'm proud of  
8 Steve. He did a great job.

9 The one thing that I want everybody to  
10 understand is I'm not an opponent of GNEP. I  
11 think anything that can be built out here to  
12 make, you know, jobs for everybody with  
13 billions of dollars at stake here, are  
14 fantastic, but you've got to follow the  
15 environmental laws. You can't just ignore  
16 them.

17 In April, I became a protected  
18 whistleblower -- well, actually, let me back  
19 up. In 2001, I became a protected DOE  
20 whistleblower, a facility operator who would  
21 not violate environmental regulations.

22 I won my case in July -- on July 11, 2003,  
23 only to find that the DOE contractors and DOE  
24 decided that they had to remove my position  
25 from the contracts. That's all -- it's all

1           in the complaints and everything. They'll be  
2           coming to downtown Paducah. I hope I have  
3           this good a show-up in October.

4           So those complaints, we don't -- as DOE  
5           said in May, we don't want to go down that  
6           trail. But what I'm here to explain to  
7           everybody is when I went before the CAB, the  
8           first time in May, because I wanted to share  
9           with them because they do handle waste and  
10          water issues, that you as a citizen have a  
11          right to go and explain these issues.

12          And when I was asked by the CAB members,  
13          -- Allen Burnett was there. I look out here,  
14          I see a lot of my fellow CAB -- I mean, some  
15          of the CAB members in the audience, Ruby and  
16          Vickie Jurka.

17          It's almost like we're talking, but you're  
18          not being -- you're not being paid attention  
19          to. So the CAB members go through a motion.  
20          And when I explained to them the violations  
21          that were not allegations, someone at DOE  
22          made a comment, "Well, we don't go down this  
23          trail of allegations."

24          Well, at the next meeting, I gave them  
25          their e-mails. So I don't make allegations.

1 I give them the detail. And if you're not  
2 going to -- if DOE will not follow the  
3 environmental regulations now, what can be  
4 expected at GNEP?

5 Bill Holsapple, good friend of mine, I  
6 worked with Bill all my life. Randy Scott,  
7 he's one of -- and some of the employees back  
8 here, I've worked with them. But if you're  
9 not going to follow the environmental laws,  
10 what could be expected at GNEP?

11 Now, in August, I identified the dump  
12 sites, or some of the people that called me.  
13 They saw my name in the headlines. They  
14 said, okay, we've got some information for  
15 you.

16 Now, I proved that I can identify those  
17 dump sites. DOE denied them for three  
18 months. Ed Whitfield called me on a late  
19 October phone call and said, "Gary, when are  
20 you going to disperse your maps?"

21 Dave Mast is on every one of my e-mails.  
22 And when those e-mails went out, I said, "I  
23 do not want to affect him and his election."

24 Within three days of that phone call, PRS  
25 exclaimed that, look, they found 7,000 cubic

1       yards of dirt out here that popped up out of  
2       nowhere.

3               Now, if we're going to do this at GNEP,  
4       and people won't recognize environmental  
5       laws, then GNEP is going to start off on the  
6       wrong foot.

7               But the value of environmental clean-out  
8       here is to the workers' health and safety of  
9       the community. For God sakes, when people  
10      are dying in the community and there's a big  
11      indicator that cancers are through the  
12      roof -- and on that same meeting in August,  
13      Dr. Clinton Cook, Mitch McConnell's best  
14      friend, who Mitch McConnell told him to come  
15      forward and support Gary -- for him to come  
16      forward, and he would support me. If I  
17      brought these things to everybody's  
18      attention, then he would support me, and he  
19      cannot deny that. And Dr. Cook is on a video  
20      down at the CAB office saying every bit of  
21      it.

22              We didn't go down the trail of what  
23      evidence we've got. That's coming. When you  
24      start looking at the gaussian plume models  
25      that we sent across the community -- I'm not

1       trying to critique any of the USEC people out  
2       here. I don't know why it was done, but the  
3       letters speak for themselves.

4             I shared this with Steve. Steve didn't  
5       have anything to do with it. There's people  
6       out there -- it's kind of like the Walter  
7       Reed hospital guy. They bring him back and  
8       blame him for it.

9             Well, for God sakes, let's go back and see  
10      what was done. Let's see what it did to the  
11      community. And for approximately nine miles  
12      on DOE's own documents, they said they  
13      contaminated the city of Paducah. And I  
14      believe that's significant when everybody  
15      steps up here.

16            We're not saying that the GNEP project is  
17      a terrible project. I think you've got to  
18      start this project, but you damn well don't  
19      come in here and poison the community even  
20      further. So environmental compliance.

21            Now, I'm going to end this, because I've  
22      got a few more things, but I think I've hit  
23      them all.

24            MR. BROWN: One minute left.

25            MR. VANDER BOEGH: One minute. This'll be

1 good.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay.

3 MR. VANDER BOEGH: Ruby English has hit  
4 the nail on the head with all the  
5 contamination, that every time you bring it  
6 up, everybody says you're not credible.

7 This Chris Naas here stepped up at a CAB  
8 meeting. I shared that with Dave Mast as I  
9 walked in the door. Dave Mast said,  
10 "Evidence says he's not credible."

11 Now, what in the devil do you have to do  
12 to say you're credible around here? Because  
13 all we're trying to do is say follow the  
14 environmental laws that Congress established,  
15 not DOE.

16 And so DOE plays a game. If you follow  
17 the laws, you're terminated. So I'm a  
18 protected DOE whistleblower that DOE fired,  
19 has a hand in my firing. Now, that's fine.  
20 It gives me plenty of time to come down here.

21 Now, what I want to close -- really, this  
22 is a closing statement. When Mr. Murphie  
23 addressed some of this to his staff when this  
24 was going in the headlines, a comment was  
25 made with a lot of employees, and I don't

1 name who they are, because I've already got a  
2 whistleblower protection list in the Attorney  
3 General's office right now, but nobody knows  
4 but my attorney and the Attorney General.  
5 And it's numbered, so Joe Walker's got the  
6 number, but he doesn't know the names.

7 So Mr. Murphie stepped forward and  
8 retaliated against all these employees that  
9 have come forward or you know you've said  
10 this to, and he said, I quote, "If you think  
11 I care about your families," meaning this  
12 community, "I don't care about mine."

13 That went out to Joe Walker when he said  
14 it, because all the employees started calling  
15 me. And I really don't appreciate being put  
16 in this kind of position, but I don't mind to  
17 now, because I'm here. My record was  
18 100 percent compliance, 14 years without a  
19 notice of violation, and now the new company  
20 just got one. Okay. Thank you.

21 I would like to add, if you don't mind,  
22 this is not the Bill Murphie I'm talking  
23 about.

24 MR. BROWN: Let the record show.

25 Lynn King. And Craig Guess will follow.

1 MS. KING: Hi. I'm Lynn King. I'm vice  
2 president of business development at Lourdes  
3 Hospital here in Paducah. And I'm also on  
4 several boards, including the Paducah Area  
5 Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Paducah  
6 Economic Development Council, and West  
7 Kentucky Academy. I'm also involved in  
8 several community committees. But most  
9 importantly, I'm a wife and mother of three  
10 little boys age three and under.

11 This project means a lot to Lourdes  
12 Hospital and the medical community. Lourdes  
13 is one of the largest employers in the  
14 region, and we are a large tertiary facility  
15 with advanced technology and highly  
16 specialized physicians typically seen in  
17 urban areas.

18 This project means additional employment  
19 in this area so we can continue to have the  
20 state-of-the-art medical technology, highly  
21 trained medical professionals, and high  
22 quality of care. This project allows us to  
23 keep these specialized services in our  
24 community.

25 The bottom line for us is that if there's

1 another large employer, then Lourdes can  
2 provide more medical services which helps us  
3 employ more nurses, more technologists, more  
4 therapists, and other healthcare  
5 professionals.

6 There are also a lot of regional benefits  
7 from the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.  
8 It provides additional tax revenues, which  
9 helps pay for healthcare, education, roads,  
10 and other community services. Our community  
11 would greatly benefit from these additional  
12 tax dollars. It also provides continuing  
13 economic development growth and opportunities  
14 for western Kentucky.

15 Siting GNEP here would make use of a lot  
16 of talents and resources that are already  
17 available. We've talked about the expertise  
18 in the nuclear energy, but we also have a lot  
19 of talent and resources in the medical  
20 industry.

21 Lourdes plays an active role in training  
22 and preparing medical professionals in the  
23 region to respond to any medical emergency or  
24 disaster. In the past year, we have been  
25 training on chemical, nuclear, bioterrorism,

1 earthquake, and radiation emergencies. We  
2 continuously have mock disaster drills to  
3 ensure we are prepared.

4 For example, in September, we participated  
5 in the Gaseous Diffusion Plant's community  
6 disaster drill. And last April, we had  
7 training on chemicals at the plant.

8 We ensure the training is consistent with  
9 the Homeland Security requirements and work  
10 closely with the Purchase area district  
11 Health Department and the state of Kentucky.

12 So we have a team of medical  
13 professionals, the facilities, the policies  
14 and procedures, and the willingness to make  
15 sure, if there are any medical emergencies,  
16 the community is prepared to respond.

17 I support the Global Nuclear Energy  
18 Partnership program as a businesswoman, as a  
19 wife, and a mother. Along with the other  
20 community members, I will stay engaged in the  
21 public comment process to ensure we are all  
22 fairly represented. I appreciate the  
23 opportunity to speak with you today.

24 MR. BROWN: Thanks.

25 MR. GUESS: I'm Craig Guess. I'm a

1 citizen, a businessman in the community. I'm  
2 the president of Vanguard Contractors, a  
3 general contractor with a long history in  
4 this community. I currently serve as the  
5 president of the Western Kentucky  
6 Construction Association comprised of 436  
7 construction-related companies from our  
8 region. Additionally, I am chair of the  
9 board of the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce  
10 which serves nearly 1,750 companies across  
11 the state.

12 The future of this region is important to  
13 me, just as it is to all of you and all of  
14 these who have come here tonight. I share in  
15 the commitment to give our region the best  
16 possible future.

17 Clearly, this GNEP would benefit the  
18 entire Paducah region in a major way. There  
19 are benefits of nuclear energy to the world  
20 and especially to the United States. Nuclear  
21 energy is environmentally friendly. GNEP  
22 makes use of scarce resources and reduces  
23 waste streams. GNEP improves national and  
24 international safety and the energy balance  
25 in the world.

1           This approximately \$15 billion project  
2           would produce a stream of major benefits to  
3           the Paducah region and the entire state and  
4           with an annual impact of over 140 million as  
5           previously stated.

6           The project would vault this region into  
7           national prominence, would create an  
8           attractive environment for the support  
9           industries to locate in Paducah, such as  
10          equipment manufacturers, engineering  
11          companies, et cetera.

12          There are issues to be resolved, such as  
13          engineering the plant for a seismic event and  
14          ensuring that licensing processes are  
15          established to high-level radioactive waste  
16          from being accumulated in Paducah.

17          However, technologies for earthquake  
18          engineering have advanced over the last few  
19          decades to the point that the solutions do  
20          exist. And the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
21          has well-established processes for licensing  
22          nuclear facility design, construction, and  
23          operation.

24          I support bringing GNEP to Paducah and  
25          will stay engaged with other citizens of this

1 community during the public comment process  
2 to ensure that safety of operations and waste  
3 disposal standards and regulations are  
4 applied to this project.

5 We need this project, and, more  
6 importantly, we want this project. Thank  
7 you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you. George Johnson.

9 MR. JOHNSON: As he said, my name is  
10 George Johnson. I retired from the Paducah  
11 Gaseous Diffusion Plant from WestKem in 2003,  
12 March 2003. I was the first full-time  
13 employee in waste management on the DOE side  
14 of the house, and I know a lot of these  
15 people out here. I worked for many of the  
16 people, including Steve and others.

17 When I moved over to the DOE side, I had  
18 worked for two years as a front line  
19 supervisor in waste management in the field,  
20 so I understood how the field operation was  
21 managed. I wrote a lot of the procedures  
22 that were applied to the field operation. I  
23 wrote the justification for the B class  
24 operator, which is a waste handler at the  
25 Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

1 I came to the plant from Long Concrete  
2 where I was vice president and ran -- was  
3 active manager of the Redi-Mix operation for  
4 three and a half years. So I think I  
5 understand a little bit about how to manage a  
6 full-time field operation. I've supervised  
7 at times as many as 70 people.

8 What I saw when I went to the DOE side of  
9 the house appalled me as a business person.  
10 And what I'm going to do to DOE, you've heard  
11 the pros and cons, and I'm not going to sit  
12 up here and tell you pros and cons about  
13 this. Most people's minds are made up, and  
14 this will be done regardless of what I say.

15 What I am going to do for DOE is encourage  
16 you to run your business like a business.  
17 When I took over the field operation in waste  
18 management, there was over 100,000 gallons of  
19 waste water that nobody knew where it had  
20 come from or how it had been generated. It  
21 was improperly handled.

22 There were nearly 5,000 55-gallon drums of  
23 waste sitting out on an open waste storage  
24 pad that were not being properly managed.  
25 Many of them were deteriorated to the point

1           that they were leaking waste.   Some of that  
2           waste leaked out onto the ground.

3           Mr. Penrod was out there when I was there.  
4           Probably, he was in operations and didn't get  
5           to see a lot of this.   But I got to see it  
6           sometimes at 3:00 in the morning, because I'd  
7           get a call because a farm tank that was used  
8           to house radioactive waste, some hazardous  
9           waste, was sitting out and allowed to freeze,  
10          and the pipe nipple would burst, and then it  
11          would thaw out.   And at 3:00 in the morning,  
12          George would get a call at home from the  
13          shift superintendent office saying, "Come out  
14          and tell us what to do with this stuff,"  
15          because nobody seemed to know what it was.

16          Now, if you think the same people that  
17          managed this business are going to manage  
18          this new business in a different manner, then  
19          I'll encourage you to invite that business  
20          here.

21          If you don't think they can manage it any  
22          better than that, then what I'll do is  
23          encourage you to watch very closely.   Any  
24          business that's operated, you can write it on  
25          a piece of paper.   Listen, I've watched them

1        spend millions of dollars generating some of  
2        the prettiest type of words that I've ever  
3        seen that tell you how to do things. And  
4        darned if they can't seem to follow them,  
5        because nobody manages what that paper says.  
6        We just take it for granted that the paper  
7        says this is going to be done this way, and  
8        that's the way it's done.

9        Well, it ain't that way. So you think  
10       about this. Because I spent a lot of time  
11       out there. And I'm not as eloquent a speaker  
12       as John Williams. And I spent many years in  
13       the Lions Club with John, and we raised lots  
14       of money for a very worthy cause. He's a  
15       great speaker and a great persuader in  
16       getting business here.

17       But ole John didn't get up at 3:00 with  
18       George and go out there and look and say, how  
19       do all you smart people, highly educated, and  
20       some of the finest people that I've ever  
21       worked with in my life allow this type of  
22       thing to happen? And these people are  
23       Ph.D.s, some of them.

24       So what I'm going to tell you is this.  
25       Whatever you do, wherever you put this

1 business, manage it and make sure that when  
2 you say, "We're going to do it this way, and  
3 we're going to store it this way, and if it  
4 doesn't happen this way, we're going to make  
5 sure it doesn't happen again," manage it that  
6 way.

7 MR. BROWN: That concludes the number of  
8 folks who have signed up ahead of time to  
9 speak. Let me ask you if there's anyone who  
10 hasn't spoken yet who would like to make a  
11 comment at this point. I would let those go  
12 first.

13 Okay. Please step forward and just  
14 identify yourself by name and affiliation if  
15 appropriate.

16 MR. EHLEBEN: My name is Bill Ehleben.  
17 I'm really nobody from nowhere. And you know  
18 what? I look at all you-all business people  
19 and what I see is dollar signs in your eyes.

20 And you know, this is the second largest  
21 fault line in the United States. You can't  
22 see it. You're not listening. All you're  
23 seeing is those dollar signs. It's  
24 really -- it's a shame. It's an  
25 embarrassment to think that you would allow

1       this to happen in this community. I'm  
2       just -- I am ashamed to even be up here  
3       because this is a no-brainer, folks. It's a  
4       no-brainer.

5       This is the New Madrid fault line, 20  
6       miles as the crow flies. An 8 point on the  
7       Richter scale could happen tomorrow. The one  
8       that happened before rang the bells in  
9       Boston. I don't care what kind of plant you  
10      build here, it's going to go to the ground,  
11      and we're not talking about the candy that  
12      they're working at. I used to work at the  
13      USEC plant. DOE are liars. I'm telling you  
14      firsthand. You believe them. You can listen  
15      to people that's already been up here  
16      tonight. I know what they said. They told  
17      me when I hired in there I could eat that  
18      stuff, and it would pass right out of me, and  
19      I'd be safe. Thank God I don't have cancer,  
20      but it doesn't mean I'm not going to get  
21      cancer.

22      Folks, you need to pass the word around.  
23      This is not the place for this to be. This  
24      is -- these things are going to come in from  
25      Europe. They're going to come in from all

1 over the world. They're going to be  
2 traveling down I-24, Western Kentucky  
3 Parkway. This is not candy. This is bomb  
4 grade uranium.

5 I don't think you get it. I really don't.  
6 I don't think you understand the potential  
7 that's going to happen, can happen, probably  
8 will happen with management as we've seen in  
9 the past. I'm just -- I'm just in shock. I  
10 really hope you guys think about this. Thank  
11 you.

12 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Another  
13 first-time speaker? Please.

14 MS. D'ANGELO: Good evening. My name is  
15 Amanda D'Angelo, and I am a senior  
16 engineering physics major at Murray State  
17 University. So, obviously, don't hold them  
18 accountable for anything that I say. They're  
19 just my opinion.

20 I wasn't going to get up and speak, but so  
21 far tonight I've heard one person from the  
22 scientific community get up here.

23 And I want to start off by saying that I  
24 am a strong advocate for nuclear energy, but  
25 as an engineer, they not only teach us about

1       how to build things, about research. They  
2       teach us about economics and ethics.

3           And I would like to give you some of my  
4       experience. I've worked with the research  
5       reactor at NC State in Raleigh, North  
6       Carolina. And I've also had the privilege of  
7       visiting and being able to work with the  
8       three nuclear power plants that TVA has in  
9       the area.

10           Economically, this would be amazing for  
11       our area. We have seen such hardship as far  
12       as companies leaving and going other places,  
13       people out of jobs, people moving away.  
14       However, ethically, I cannot see bringing  
15       such a threat into our community.

16           I will move to wherever you build this. I  
17       want it. I want it really bad. Nuclear fuel  
18       recycling is top on my list. However, with  
19       the threat of an earthquake, of us living on  
20       the New Madrid fault line, it's just too  
21       much. This community has seen hardship as a  
22       result of the gaseous diffusion plant in the  
23       past, not now.

24           But something like that reoccurring  
25       because of a natural disaster is just -- as

1       an engineer, I have to think about the  
2       ethical side, and I cannot put this community  
3       through something like that again. So I'm so  
4       for it, but not here.

5           MR. BROWN: Yes. We have another speaker.

6           MS. KEMP: I'm Merryman Kemp. I know many  
7       of the people in the audience here.

8           And I doubt that you got my name  
9       correctly, so I'll tell you about it later.  
10       I'll talk to you about it later.

11          I had no intention of speaking tonight,  
12       but I feel compelled to. I didn't realize  
13       when I came that you needed credentials to  
14       speak, but I do have a few. I don't know  
15       where to start. I've gathered titles and  
16       honors since I was ten years old. I'm a  
17       businesswoman. I have two children. One of  
18       them is a CPA here in Paducah, and he has  
19       three children. My older son is a graduate  
20       of Annapolis. He's also a graduate of  
21       Paducah Tilghman. He's been in the United  
22       States Navy for 26 years. So some of you  
23       know what his next rank will be.

24          I've been president of the Kentucky  
25       Women's Political Caucus. During my tenure,

1 we increased our membership by 400 percent.

2 I was the first president of my professional  
3 organization in Paducah who happened to be of  
4 a female gender. And I could go on and on,  
5 but I won't.

6 I will tell you, though, that I served as  
7 a member of this CAB, and as the chair of  
8 this CAB. So I think that does give me a  
9 little bit of credibility.

10 Some people who are here tonight -- and I  
11 realize many of them have already gone -- are  
12 not too familiar with the nuclear facility  
13 jargon. But I tell you that, in my opinion,  
14 we should never have started using the word  
15 "cleanup," because cleanup with the state of  
16 our technology -- and there are those here  
17 who have said how far advanced it is, how  
18 much more advanced it is since 1952. And  
19 that's true, but we still cannot clean up the  
20 Pandora's box that we opened. We're talking  
21 about much more radioactive material than  
22 that that we've dealt with in the past.

23 I did want to point out one thing. This  
24 was in your packet, the one with the silly  
25 picture of that man on the bottom. If you

1 look on the back of that one, this  
2 publication speaks of the Yucca Mountain  
3 disposal facility as though it's a done deal.  
4 It is not a done deal at all. And this is  
5 typical of what I found from DOE, the entire  
6 time I served on the CAB. You can't always  
7 trust what you read.

8 Speaking of read, if Harry Reed gets his  
9 way, Yucca Mountain facility will not be in  
10 operation.

11 Two, Paducah's very proud of the artist  
12 relocation program. If we become -- if we  
13 allow ourselves to become -- if we sell out  
14 for the money, we will only get more nuclear  
15 waste type businesses. We will not have  
16 anything else like the Paducah artist  
17 relocation program.

18 I know that you-all did not want to hear  
19 what Ms. Hanson had to say. I know you  
20 didn't want to hear what Mrs. English had to  
21 say. I know Ruby English. I knew her  
22 husband. I know her son. And I wish every  
23 one of you -- I wish she'd had more time to  
24 tell you exactly how many metals one of her  
25 sons has in his body. He played in one of

1           those bayous as a little boy growing up.

2           MR. BROWN:   About a minute left.

3           MS. KEMP:    That will be sufficient.   Thank  
4           you.

5           MR. BROWN:   Okay.

6           MS. KEMP:    I did want to mention, too -- I  
7           forgot one of my credentials.   My father  
8           worked as a union man.   He had his head split  
9           open in the -- well, that was in the early  
10          '40s.   That lets you know about how old I am.  
11          I've been -- I'm old enough to have been  
12          around a long time.   But he used that money  
13          to buy the farm back home in Tennessee.   This  
14          is the first time in my life I have ever  
15          stood on the other side from the union, and  
16          it makes me very sad.

17          But I want to ask you -- this is my last  
18          point.   I came up here tonight because I want  
19          to be on record as opposing this for the sake  
20          of my children, for my grandchildren, and my  
21          great grandchildren.   And I ask you, those of  
22          you who are in favor of this, do you want  
23          this as your legacy?

24          MR. BROWN:   Thank you.   Anyone else?   Let  
25          me get first-time people and then

1           we'll -- anyone else who hasn't spoken yet  
2           who would like to say anything? Okay.

3           MR. POLK: Just one second is all I'm  
4           asking for. I'm David Polk again. Maybe I  
5           missed something, but I don't think we've had  
6           a public debate about this in Paducah.

7           My sense is that the local media and the  
8           political leaders in the city and the county  
9           got behind this very quickly, and it's easy  
10          to see why they would. But have we had  
11          anything like a public debate on it? Maybe  
12          someone can enlighten me on that.

13          I don't think we have. That is the kind  
14          of public forum where we're hearing from both  
15          sides on kind of a city-wide or county-wide  
16          basis. This is a democracy. We're hearing  
17          from all the leaders of the city, but what  
18          are the people themselves thinking? In a  
19          democracy, they should be informed and have  
20          their own opinions aired.

21          So I'd like to challenge the political  
22          leaders of Paducah and McCracken County to  
23          have a referendum and let that be preceded by  
24          an open public debate so that the average guy  
25          on the street gets a sense of what's really

1 at stake.

2 Doesn't that sound like a good democratic  
3 idea?

4 (Applause)

5 Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Anyone else?

7 (No response)

8 We are scheduled to stay in session  
9 another 26 minutes or so. Generally, what we  
10 do, I will recess the meeting. If anybody  
11 has something to add, simply come up and see  
12 me. I'll reconvene, and we'll record your  
13 comments.

14 So at this point, I want to thank  
15 everybody for attending. Also, your respect  
16 for the various points of view that were  
17 expressed here is admirable and unusual. But  
18 thanks very much and we are recessed.

19 (A brief recess was taken.)

20 MR. BROWN: I'm reconvening this scoping  
21 meeting on GNEP and asking if any other  
22 member of the public wishes to make a comment  
23 at this time.

24 (No response)

25 Noting that no member of the public wishes

1           to provide further comment, I am adjourning  
2           this meeting at the hour of 9:30.

3           Thank you.

4           (The hearing was concluded at 9:30 p.m.)  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 STATE OF KENTUCKY

2 COUNTY OF McCRACKEN

3  
4 I, AMY S. CARONONGAN, RPR, CSR (IL), and  
5 Notary Public in and for said State of Kentucky at  
6 Large, do hereby certify that the above and  
7 foregoing is a true, correct, and complete  
transcript of the GNEP public scoping meeting,  
taken at the time and place; that said public  
hearing was taken down in stenotype by me and  
thereafter transcribed.

8 I further certify that I am neither  
9 attorney for, nor counsel for, nor related to, nor  
employed by any of the parties to the action in  
10 which this GNEP scoping meeting is taken; and  
further, that I am not a relative or employee of  
11 any attorney or counsel employed by the parties  
hereto nor financially interested in the action.

12 My commission expires on June 9, 2007.

13 Given under my hand and seal of office on  
14 this the 21st day of March, 2007.

15  
16 s/ Amy S. Caronongan  
17 AMY S. CARONONGAN, RPR, CSR (IL)  
18 Notary Public  
19 State of Kentucky at Large  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25